

JX

1908

U6N68

1910





The Nations cannot, or at least will not, disarm until there shall have been established a Supreme Court of International Justice endowed with authority to determine ALL international controversies and with power to enforce its decrees. This means that out of the Hague Tribunal shall come a true Peace Federation of the Nations.

The Peace Movement

The Federation of the World

"God governs the world; the actual working of His government--the carrying out of His plan--is the history of the world."

—Hegel: "Philosophy of History," p. 36.

"Were half the power that fills the world with error,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts."

—Longfellow.

PUBLISHED AT NEW YORK, 1910

—BY—

THE WORLD-FEDERATION LEAGUE
A Department of the New York Peace Society
507 Fifth Avenue

THE JOHNSON PRESS
NEW YORK

JX1908
U6 N68
1910

Dedicated

to

Andrew Carnegie

Whose enduring monument will be the Temple of Peace at The Hague.

History will record his name for his work in the
cause of Universal Peace.

By ~~transmission~~

JAN 14 1913

CONTENTS

The World-Federation League.....	1
Introduction	4
The Federation of the World: <i>Walter John Bartnett</i>	7
Editorial Comment in "The Arena".....	22
Andrew Carnegie on the Peace Movement.....	23
International School of Peace: <i>Edwin Ginn</i>	29
Letter from President Taft.....	38
Theodore Roosevelt and the Peace Movement: <i>W. J. Bartnett</i>	39
A Suggestion from Willian T. Stead.....	42
A League of Peace: <i>Andrew Carnegie</i>	42
A Christmas Plea for Perpetual and Universal Peace: <i>John Temple Graves</i>	44
Who Shall Lead the World to the World's Desire? <i>John Temple Graves</i>	48
Articles of Federation for the Federated States of the World: <i>Oscar T. Crosby</i>	50
A Constitution of the World:	59
Roosevelt—A Suggestion: <i>Henry G. Granger</i>	61
The Task of Mr. Roosevelt: <i>The Independent</i>	66
Permanent Peace the World's Need: <i>Henry G. Granger</i>	68
The Proposed High Court of Nations: <i>James L. Tryon</i>	71
Paraphrase of Secretary Knox's Circular to the Powers.....	81
Knox for Arbitral Court: <i>N. Y. Times</i>	84
An Arbitral Tribunal: <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>	86
Reply of France to the Knox Proposal: <i>N. Y. Evening Post</i>	88
The Peace Movement: <i>W. J. Bartnett</i>	89
Cost of "Armed Peace" to the Nations of the World: <i>Representative Tawney in N. Y. Times</i>	93
It is Time to Protest: <i>Boston Herald</i>	99
Halting Naval Extravagance: <i>N. Y. World</i>	102
One-Tenth of One Per Cent. for Peace: <i>N. Y. Times</i>	103
America Now Has Opportunity to Lead the World to Peace or War: <i>John Temple Graves</i>	104
Madness of Aerial Warfare: <i>Thomas J. Vivian</i>	107
Comparisons: Education and War-Preparation: <i>Christian Science Sentinel</i>	109
Words of President Taft: <i>John Temple Graves</i>	111
President Taft on National Honor.....	113
Words of Cardinal Gibbons.....	114
" Hon. John W. Foster.....	114
" Senator Burton.....	114
" Dr. Benj. Ide Wheeler.....	115
" Dr. R. S. MacArthur.....	116
" Hon. Richard Bartholdt.....	117
" Hon. Chas. W. Fairbanks.....	117
" King Edward.....	118
Practical Steps to Secure International Peace: <i>W. J. Bartnett</i>	119
Statue of Universal Peace—A Suggestion.....	122
Position of the Christian Worker for Peace: <i>W. Evans Darby</i>	124
The Voice of Religion.....	126
Universal Peace (poem): <i>Harriet Bartnett</i>	128

The World-Federation League

The World-Federation League declares its object in its name, but the declaration requires limitation.

It is not the intent of this organization to urge changes in the existing forms of national governments or the formation of one government which should attempt to regulate the domestic affairs of all lands. The contemplated Federation of the Nations is designed only to lessen the occasions of war and to diminish the constantly increasing burdens on all states of maintaining armies and navies beyond those required for the necessary internal policing of the several nations.

Other societies having as their general object the promotion of international peace, were in existence when a small number of men associated themselves in the League for the more efficient direction of their interest and energy toward the cause in question.

A reason for the existence of several societies having a common object, is found in the fact that different minds figure to themselves the desired state of peace among nations as fixed in different particular forms of a central government; and they propose to themselves different particular efforts as suitable for hastening the day of establishment of *some* form of central government, empowered to keep the peace.

From the nature of the case, it may be assumed that these various efforts will not conflict with each other, but, on the contrary, will co-operate as parallel forces urging men and nations toward a future practical brotherhood.

Therefore the League feels no hesitation in addressing itself to all men, soliciting their consideration of certain specific steps which, it is believed, may now be beneficially taken by the Government of the United States, and which are indicated in the following Joint Resolution of Congress, which has been introduced in the House by Hon. Richard Bartholdt.

Proposed Joint Resolution of the Congress of the United States of America

WHEREAS modern means of communication now afford to the people of all nations a better understanding of their common interests than the people heretofore and

WHEREAS such mutual understanding and its resultant sympathy between the people of all countries provide the moral basis for a citizenship of the world; and

WHEREAS this universal citizenship requires an organ of expression and of action to the end that it may bear proper fruit in diminishing the desolations of war and in promoting human happiness through peaceful co-operation of states;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed advisable that the Government of the United States give public expression to a form of articles of International Federation which, in substance, may be recommended to other Governments as a fitting instrument for realizing world-wide aspirations toward the amelioration of harsh conditions now suffered by multitudes, and which, in part, are due to an ever-present fear of international war;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that a commission of five members be appointed by the President of the United States; the duties of such commission to be as follows: —

FIRST: To urge upon the attention of other Governments the fact that relief from the heavy burden of military expenditures and from the disasters of war can best be obtained by the establishment of an International Federation;

SECONDLY: To report to Congress, as soon as practicable, a draft of articles of a Federation limited to the maintenance of peace, through the establishment of an international Court having power to determine by decree all controversies between nations and to enforce execution of its decrees by the arms of the Federation, such arms to be provided to the Federation and controlled solely by it.

THIRDLY: To consider and report upon any other means to diminish the expenses of Government for military purposes and to lessen the probabilities of war.

The above Resolution, if passed, will engage the people of the American Union in an official, frank and energetic effort directed to the establishment of a central authority *duly endowed with power* to diminish the burden of war-preparation and the probability of war-execution throughout the world.

This may possibly be effected by increasing the powers of the Hague Conference and the Hague Court, making of the Hague Conference a true parliamentary body, with powers of limited legislation, and of the Hague Court a true international tribunal with power, as mentioned above, to settle *all* controversies between nations. This implies the control by the said court of an armed force to execute its decrees.

The work of determining exactly what endowment of power is necessary and practicable, lies just beyond the accomplishment of such specific official action as is contained in the proposals above outlined. They are believed to be *practical, concrete beginnings*.

Should President Taft appoint a Peace Commission composed of, say, Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Carnegie, Elihu Root, Joseph H. Choate and Richard Bartholdt, can anyone doubt that great results would be obtained?

If you approve the objects of the League, will you not kindly communicate your approval to the Secretary? Will you not write your views at length to the Secretary? Your suggestions may aid the League in the work it has undertaken.

Will you not write to the Senators and Representatives of your State, urging their furtherance of the proposals mentioned?

F. MILTON WILLIS, Secretary,
Care of NEW YORK PEACE SOCIETY
507 Fifth Avenue, NEW YORK

Introduction

This pamphlet is issued to present succinctly some of the more recent facts and opinions relating to the Peace Movement, it being understood that the League is responsible for the utterances on pp. 1, 2 and 3, and that it presents the other matter herein as being of interest in this connection.

This widely-beneficent movement has been slowly evolving. Through the well-directed efforts of the many Peace Societies throughout the world and the work of the many illustrious men and women who have devoted themselves to this cause during the past two decades, the beginning of the end appears to be at hand.

The active interest that

Theodore Roosevelt,
President Taft,
Andrew Carnegie,
Hon. Elihu Root,
Miss Jane Addams,
Secretary Knox,
Hon. Richard Bartholdt,
Hon. William Jennings Bryan,
Hon. Joseph H. Choate,
Robert Bacon,
William R. Hearst,
Whitelaw Reid,
Mr. Samuel Gompers,
President David Starr Jordan,
Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead,
Hon. George von L. Meyer,
Hon. Charles Nagel,
Hon. Horace Porter,
Hon. Albert K. Smiley,
Mrs. Henry Villard,
Hon. George W. Wickersham,
Hon. Frederick W. Lehmann,
Prof. John Bassett Moore,
Hon. Theodore Burton,
Rev. F. A. Kahler,
Elbert Hubbard,
B. O. Flower,
Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy,
Archbishop Ireland,
Robert G. Ingersoll,
David Lubin,
Edwin Ginn,

W. O. McDowell,
Hon. James B. McCreary,
Hon. David J. Brewer,
Hon. W. I. Buchanan,
Hon. John W. Foster,
Rev. Edward Everett Hale,
Bishop W. F. McDowell,
Edwin D. Mead,
Hon. J. M. Dickinson,
Hon. Robert Treat Paine,
Most Rev. James E. Quigley,
Hon. James Brown Scott,
Hon. Oscar S. Strauss,
Dr. Booker T. Washington,
Rev. Emil G. Hirsch,
Dr. Benj. F. Trueblood,
Dr. Lyman Abbott,
Rev. James L. Tryon,
John Temple Graves,
Mrs. Annie Besant,
Cardinal Gibbons,
Hon. Richard A. Ballinger,
Andrew D. White,
Hon. W. W. Morrow,
Rev. Robert Stuart MacArthur,
Hamilton Holt,
Dr. Benjamin Ide Wheeler,
W. H. Short,
Geo. E. Roberts,
Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones,
Hon. Frank G. Newlands,
Hon. James A. Tawney,
Hon. Chas. W. Fairbanks,

and many others in our fair land—not to mention those in the

public eye, of other lands, such as Leo XIII., Count Tolstoy, King Edward, the Czar, William T. Stead, Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, Baron Marschall von Bieberstein and the distinguished recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize—the active interest that all these advocates of peace are evincing, is rapidly aggregating into an irresistible potency that will eventually rid the world of the heart-break of war, and save the struggling poor from the paralyzing incubus of military expenditures.

That practical results can be had in a world-movement is attested by the fact that all the great nations have recently founded the International Institute of Agriculture. David Lubin, an American, carried to a successful conclusion this beneficent project—with the result that 1910 will see this Institute undertaking the work for which it was designed.

In the cause of Universal Peace two great ideas have been recently promulgated in the United States. One is the suggestion by Secretary Knox of the establishment of a Court of Arbitral Justice. The other is a suggestion of the appointment of a special peace commission composed of men such as Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Carnegie, Elihu Root, Richard Bartholdt and Joseph H. Choate, to formulate definite, practical plans for the speedier effectuation of permanent peace. There is no conflict in these ideas. Both are in line with real progress and both are meeting with approval in America and in Europe.

Furthermore, the recent donation of one million dollars by Edwin Ginn of Boston to assist the cause of Universal Peace is certain to be productive of results.

At this auspicious moment when there is being contemplated *the wasting of hard-earned hundreds of millions in the building of monsters of the air, in addition to monsters of the sea, for the destruction of the lives and property of the very people who will have supplied, through a burdensome taxation, the means for their construction*, it is most earnestly to

be hoped that the press of the world will pour lavishly into the channels of thought this magnificent idea of peace universal through practical arbitration. Let the art of aviation be the sign of a new day. Let it not be devoted to destruction. Let it serve to bring the nations closer together, on the ground of a higher *morale*. May the press, with its unlimited power for good, espouse wholeheartedly this paramount cause of to-day.

The Federation of the World

By WALTER JOHN BARTNETT

The federation of the world—a conception so grandiose as probably to seem chimerical to one who has not observed the signs of the times, seems nevertheless to be slowly but surely taking form and substance.

Far in the past, on the minds of the world-conquerors, shone the ideal of a world united. In the present, on many a mind is shining this great ideal; but now has the dreamt-of tyranny of the past been glorified into the idea of a union of the nations in a voluntary federation.

Like the growth of a tree from a seed, the growth of the modern ideal has been of an inevitable and fateful character; and in its present stage a discerning eye can perceive the outlines of the grand consummation.

Immediately preceding the more definite conception of a world-federation are to be seen a number of nourishing factors—each adding its quota, its energy; as, for example, the application of steam to navigation and to land transportation, the extension of telegraph and telephone, the industrial inventions which have rendered each country dependent on others for vast quantities of supplies, the practice of international loaning of money, the growth of international brotherhoods, the readier and cheaper production of books, the growth of the press, the increase of general education, together with the potent humanizing activities of the great Republic of Letters, and the consequent partial eradication of national prejudices; each of these bringing material benefit and inculcating ideas of interdependence and mutual help on a national scale.

Let us consider now that which corresponds to the sapling—the young form which, out of the darkness and groping of the life in the soil, has risen to view and, though but partly developed, foreshadows the coming tree.

It is commonly accepted that the welfare and prosperity of mankind depend more upon agriculture than upon any other industry. Statistics from all lands on the production and consumption of agricultural products, intelligently disseminated, must affect the destinies of millions of people. Official and reliable data concerning the results obtained by such men as Luther Burbank, and miscellaneous information such as that gathered by organizations like the United States Department of Agriculture, if spread throughout the world freely for the benefit of all who are interested, cannot but profoundly influence for the better the agriculture of the world and consequently improve the condition of the people. If the advance made by our farmers in wheat-growing during the past ten years could be intelligently presented to the peasants of Russia, much of the agrarian trouble of that country would be remedied. If the information that the California fruit-growers possess could be transmitted to the agriculturists in Siberia, fruit-growing would in a decade be one of the great industries of a large portion of that territory. On the other hand, could the agriculturists of our country receive accurate information freely and readily concerning the products of field and orchard and vineyard of the remainder of the world, our advance in these matters must proceed apace. The food supply of hundreds of millions of people is now being brought from far-distant points; to cheapen the marketing and insure the purity of this food must necessarily enhance the well-being of those who depend upon it. Reliable information as to crops and as to agricultural products in storage and in transit the world over, will tend to promote a better adjustment of supply to demand, promptly and sometimes with incalculable benefit to millions of people, as in cases of threatened famine.

The United States of America spends millions per annum in securing information of this character pertaining to its own territory, but the benefits derived are but partial, owing to the lack of accurate statistics concerning other countries.

The inference from all this is: that the welfare of the world is to a considerable degree suffering from a want of co-operation of the nations in this very vital department of human activity; and that it would be to the advantage of all were the governments of the world to come to an agreement on this subject—an agreement best embodied in a permanent form, perhaps, by the establishment of an international board of competent delegates from each nation, whose duty it should be to promote the advancement of all forms of agriculture throughout the world irrespective of nationality or of personal interests.

To one man belongs the honor of perceiving this clearly and of bringing it about—Mr. David Lubin, of California. Through his efforts was the King of Italy converted to his views. Thereupon under the leadership of the King was inaugurated a movement of such strength that finally forty-two nations assented to the plan of co-operation proposed; and but a short time ago the Senate of the United States ratified a protocol committing our country to its support. Thus has been born the International Institute of Agriculture, to be supported by funds from the treasuries of nearly all nations—the first voluntary world-movement of all-embracing import.

So interrelated are human affairs that, having been firmly established and begun its work, this institute will gradually enlarge its scope and more and more firmly cement the common interests of mankind throughout the world. And so potent is suggestion and so fecund are fundamental ideas, that from this new organization and that older one, the International Postal Union, which has accomplished so much for the intercommunication of the peoples of the world, will spring others of their sort.

The movements which are embodied in the Interparliamentary Union and the American Society of International Law are directed towards the codification of international law and the firm establishment of principles that will be recognized by the courts of every land. During the Russo-Japanese troubles the peoples of many lands were concerned with the question as to what articles were contraband. The principles of international law as interpreted by various writers were not uniform, the result being that merchants were at a loss as to what course of action to follow. This is an example of many that might be presented wherein great benefits will flow from the coming together of all nations in an institution that will reduce these matters to order and uniformity; the principles finally settled upon, to become active by being incorporated in the various international treaties.

In connection with the establishment of the International Institute of Agriculture and the formulation of definite laws operative between the nations in peace and in war, there may well be considered the establishment of a permanent body of delegates to regulate matters of international commerce, thus providing for greater commercial freedom minimizing the risks of commerce, and affording greater legal protection and personal security to the people that engage in commerce. Through the power of the Federal Government to regulate interstate commerce, the United States of America has been able to correct some of the greater abuses that flow from the selfishness of man; for instance, that of the sale of impure foods, and that of the lack of sanitation of packing establishments. Such matters could be regulated on a world-wide scale by an International Commerce Commission.

In relation to the foregoing, and matters for consideration by such a commission, are the following:—

1. The adoption of a uniform standard of exchange throughout the world. We all know the great benefits that have resulted from the adoption by many nations of the gold standard. Yet the adoption of this standard is but a part of

the great work that must be done to render stable the commerce of the nations. When all have adopted the gold standard—as they doubtless will—a second step will be required, namely,—

2. The adoption of a common system of exchange, or money which will be good the world over. There is no reason why a system of exchange cannot be devised that will be a common measure of value in all civilized lands.

3. The establishment of a common standard of weights and measures. The good this will accomplish is obvious. The use of the metric system is gradually being extended; in another decade it will probably have become practically universal.

4. The introduction of a universal language. Such a language, of scientific construction and capable of easy expansion concurrent with growing needs of nomenclature due to new inventions and scientific discoveries,—a language which shall, along with the mother-tongue, be taught in the schools of all nations,—would be an important factor in the promotion of international understanding and popular benefit.

Through all these things will the peoples of the earth be brought into closer and closer commercial relations. Commerce will be greatly increased. In many ways will the material welfare of all be advanced. Through the masses of the populations will be diffused a greater and greater knowledge; and the consequent better understanding of one another will result in a further gain—a gain inexpressible in terms of commerce.

The question may now be asked: What is to be the effect of these movements upon the destiny of nations?

Let us try to answer this.

First: The true function of government is the advancement of the welfare of all classes. This function applies most particularly to the care of the proletariat. To advance the masses

morally and intellectually it is essential to advance them first in a material way: it is requisite to supply them with work and increase their productive capacity—their power of acquiring for themselves from soil and mine and factory and trade a greater income and thus a better environment and more leisure. For example, the people of Russia must be taught how to utilize the energy of their vast water-power, as the people of the State of New York use that of Niagara and the Californians that of the streams of the Sierra Nevada. The workers of the world who are following primitive methods must be shown how to more fully develop the energies of soil and mine and stream through modern methods. Thus will be aroused in them renewed and more intelligent industry, with greater scope for the employment of their minds: this, seemingly slow though it may be, will inevitably result in intellectual, moral, spiritual, and political progress. This awakening of the higher nature in the masses will gradually be brought about by the interworking of many factors, notably through free and compulsory education, but chiefly perhaps through the wide diffusion by the individual governments of knowledge appealing to the immediate self-interest of men, enabling them to earn more with a given amount of labor—knowledge derived from the general information and the statistics published by such international institutes as we have spoken of.

Secondly: The greater enlightenment of the people of all lands means ultimately the greater stability of government. As the people become more enlightened, they will have an ever-growing voice in government. As this proceeds, they will demand—and some are beginning to demand it now—freedom from the burden of taxation for the purpose of maintaining the immense standing armies and the great navies. In Italy the income tax alone is 14 per cent of incomes, and the total tax in some sections of that country amounts to 30 per cent of the gross earnings of the people. Already in Italy there is a movement of great proportions opposing the voting of further sums for army and navy.

The masses of Hungary are thinking the same way, as also are a large party in France and a considerable party in Germany. The prosperity of Canada and Australia has tended to broaden the minds of the masses of England in respect to taxation: perhaps it was partly in consequence of this that the voters of England in the last election more forcibly than ever before expressed themselves in opposition to the expenditure of large sums of money for the maintenance of the army.

In this connection the Russian nation is a particularly interesting subject. The peasants of Russia are thinking potently. The Douma, temporarily discountenanced, will probably become within a decade a power little dreamed of to-day by many of the statesmen of Europe. Russia is the one country in Europe that can be called the United States of Europe. The most despotic of governments, she nevertheless is thinking today the thoughts of America and studying American institutions, and in the next twenty years will have enforced many of the distinctively American ideas. Like the United States, she is composed of many races. The Russian territories contain a population of 140,000,000 people, divided into 111 races. During the past thirty years the government has been preparing for the formation of the most democratic state in all Europe: unconsciously it has been laying the foundations of a great constitutional monarchy with power vested in the people. This has been partly accomplished through the intercommunication between remote portions of the Empire provided by the construction of one of the greatest railroad systems in the world. The government now owns about 30,000 miles of railroads, valued at more than \$1,500,000,000. When the history of the past century is written, the construction of the great Siberian Railroad must be recorded as one of the most potent civilizing factors of the century. Along the line of that railroad millions of peasants will settle in the next twenty years. Emigration from European Russia into the Siberian territory will be rapid. Russia now has her outlet on the Pacific. She contemplates

building a new railroad to run from Lake Baikal through Chinese territory to Peking and the port of Tientsin. This road will open to the people of Siberia, for their agricultural products and their timber, the great markets of China; and the construction of the Panama Canal will give to this vast country a world-market. When it is remembered that Siberia is as large as the United States, that it is situated mostly in the temperate zone, that it is fertile, and that in great part the climate resembles that of the State of Illinois, one can readily understand that here the Russian peasant will rapidly advance materially and commercially, and that the form of government he will ultimately have, will be a liberal one modeled in all probability after that of the United States.

It is the destiny of the United States to extend a friendly hand to the civilization that will develop in the Russian territory bordering on the shores of the Pacific. With the friendly aid of the United States, the great markets that will open up for the products of field and forest and mine and factory of all Russia, the gradual enlightenment of the farmers and operatives of all classes in the way of improved methods learned through the agency of the international institutes, the whole population of the Empire will come in time to have the same incentives to general progress that the people of the United States have; they will see their opportunities in the lands they already possess, will endeavor to develop them to the utmost, and, like the peoples of other countries, will mightily oppose through their representatives in the Douma the maintenance of a great standing army.

As a general proposition we may say that the principle of the government of the people by the people for the people, is becoming universal, and that when the peoples of the European countries finally express themselves fully, it will be first and foremost in the way of refusing to pay taxes for the maintenance of great armies and navies. This will probably occur within the next twenty years; it will be a bloodless revolution; and its effect will be most beneficial and far-reaching, as the following considerations will indicate:—

The expenditures by the nations of Europe for military and naval purposes aggregate probably more than \$1,500,000,000 per year. In the standing armies and the navies of these nations there are now about 4,000,000 men. This vast number of men constitutes just so much energy directed to other than productive ends. What it costs to maintain these men represents, on the one hand, money derived from governmental revenues other than taxes, which money might be used by the government for the public benefit; and on the other hand, money derived from taxes, which money, retained by the tax-payers, would better their condition.

Were European states to disarm as against one another and retain armies and navies for policing only, there would probably be released say three-quarters of these 4,000,000 men, or 3,000,000 men in good physical condition, among them a considerable number of very intelligent minds. Assuming that one-tenth of these would emigrate to the New World, we have left 2,700,000 to engage in productive work in European countries. Of these about 135,000 would be officers, men of trained minds. Assuming that these 2,700,000 men would, on an average, earn \$400 per year apiece, this would mean an increase of over \$1,000,000,000 per year in wages alone. It is likely, too, that the great majority of these men would work for others and receive wages considerably lower than the value they produce.

And further: We should have that part of the governmental revenues other than taxes, and that part of the incomes of civilians expended by them as taxes, at present devoted to the maintenance of these men and the equipment, fortifications, men-of-war, etc., corresponding to them—redistributed and turned into more beneficial channels. The money thus set free to be applied to public improvements, and that now expended by civilians as taxes, but in the event of disarmament restored to them, would amount in round numbers to, say, \$1,000,000,000.

We should therefore have to the credit of European na-

tions, as the result of disarmament, a yearly increment of wealth which we may conservatively estimate at \$1,000,000,000, and a yearly addition to public improvements and personal comfort and well-being represented by the amount of \$1,000,000,000—a total betterment of \$2,000,000,000!

While the foregoing figures cannot in any case be considered exact, they nevertheless are so nearly so as to indicate the magnitude of the benefit that would result from disarmament.

In addition to the above, the following words from Mr. Vivian of the British House of Commons are to the point:—"War expenditure lessens the national and commercial credit, intensifies the unemployed problem, reduces the resources available for social reform, and presses with exceptional severity upon the industrial classes."

And the following from an editorial in "The Japan Weekly Chronicle" (Kobe):—"War" (and the writer might have added—a constant readiness for war) "creates an incubus of debt which lies as a permanent dead weight upon a country's life and enterprise—which militates against those works of public utility absolutely necessary for the national progress, and necessarily imposes a burden of taxation which is felt by every class."

The following also is pertinent:—In 1905 England spent on her army and navy an amount exceeding \$300,000,000, whereas in the same year she appropriated to Education, Science and Art only \$79,000,000. These figures need no comment.

As reason, or the great common-sense of mankind, is bound to triumph in the end, we may predict with confidence that—now that the movement has been started—the benefits that so obviously will accrue from the cessation of international wars, will eventually and perhaps in but a few years appeal with so compelling a force to the peoples of Europe that the governments will finally heed their voice and gradually disarm. In this it is likely that the weaker nations will lead.

Italy—ever one of the first nations to advance new movements—will vote to disarm, retaining but a moderate standing army and a small navy. France will follow. The people of England will presently refuse to appropriate money for extensions of the military or the navy; this the precursor of disarmament, which will follow in time. Even the people of Germany, headed as they are by the ambitious Kaiser, who is the sole force of any magnitude opposing the peace-idea, will in the course of a few years bring about reforms in the interests of reason and general well-being.

The nations having partly disarmed, due to the enlightenment of the people and their greater voice in the government, the appeal to arms in cases of international friction will indubitably become less potent than the appeal to peace through arbitration—with the consequent maintenance of commercial and governmental stability.

Therefore—repeating our propositions: first, that the true function of government is the advancement of the welfare of all classes; and secondly, that the greater enlightenment of the people of all lands means ultimately the greater stability of government; and setting beside these propositions the fact that the principle of the government of the people by the people for the people is becoming universal, and the fact that the nations are beginning to realize the self-interest that lies in co-operation—we have a warrant unimpeachable for the faith that is in us; namely, that in the course of but a few years we shall see the shaping of a true world-movement—for Japan and China, the United States of America, and the rest of the civilized world will join with the nations of Europe—toward the effectuation of an international understanding embodied in a permanent institution of universal scope.

We have now considered those things that correspond to the hidden, unconscious forces which precede the appearance of the tree above ground, and we have considered the things which correspond to the early growth and gradual shaping

of the tree: let us now consider that which corresponds to the tree itself, developed.

In this permanent institution in which all nations will join, the full characteristics of the world-federation will begin to show forth—hesitatingly at first, for it will be subjected to storms of criticism, blights of self-interest, heats of prejudice; but, even so, it will grow the hardier, and more deeply will it send its roots down into the heart of humanity and to greater purpose will it raise aloft its noble presence in the pure air of altruism, of universal benefit and good-will.

This permanent institution, this parliament of widest scope, which is to embody the international understanding, will from its very nature eventually include within its purview the more specialized international institutes. The details of its development we can hardly foretell with definiteness, but we may say with some confidence that the earliest action taken by the great nations of the world will probably be the signing of a protocol whereby they will cede to the jurisdiction of the parliament a certain armament, a certain number of ships and sailors and soldiers, for the purpose of executing the decrees of the tribunal; thus enabling all the nations with safety to disarm as against one another, retaining only such armies and navies as they may need for policing purposes. The protocol will develop into a constitution providing for executive, judicial and legislative departments, and embodying articles which in time all nations will ratify. And upon this must inevitably follow the arbitration of international disputes, the cessation of international war.

Strange is it to contemplate—and we see in it the working of the Reason which rules the world—that to the head of the most despotic of the great nations and to a representative of the most democratic belongs the credit of first practically urging the idea of the promotion of a peace universal: to the Czar Nicholas and to Andrew Carnegie is the world indebted for the preliminary shaping of this grand conception.

Mr. Carnegie has given much thought to this subject. Several years ago he pointed out the great benefits that must result from the organization of the nations into "The United States of the World." His interest in the American Society of International Law and in the peace conferences, and his construction at The Hague of the Temple of Peace, where will be housed the International Board of Arbitration and also, we hope, the International Institute of Agriculture and all other international institutes, for we believe that in this case the sooner will be effected the union of all in a true International Parliament—all this on the part of Mr. Carnegie will contribute much to the success of this great movement which has for its object the preservation of peace and the increased well-being of the peoples of all lands.

It is greatly to be desired that the International Institute of Agriculture be permanently housed at The Hague. The presence there of the representatives of that institute, working together to better the economic conditions of their respective countries, would be a factor of great potency in advancing the cause of the International Board of Arbitration and universal peace. *The Temple of Peace should be selected as the home for all the world-movements.*

With the federation of the nations under a constitution ratified by all; with the devotion of human energies in this way to the material, intellectual, and moral welfare of humanity; with the growth of tolerance through knowledge; with the perception which is bound to arise, of the interrelation of all mankind and of the fact that the happiness and prosperity of other peoples contribute to our own prosperity and happiness—with all this we have the fullness of growth which corresponds to the developed and firmly planted tree—a tree, indeed, whose trunk is humanity itself, whose greater limbs are the greater nations and whose smaller limbs are the smaller nations, whose roots are the roots of humanity in the Source of All, whose sap is the Spirit of Life.

Inevitable, fateful, not to be stayed in its growth—obvi-

ously a part of the Divine Plan—proceeds this great idea. Let the mothers and the teachers of all lands aid in its progress. To spread this gospel is a work of sublime importance. Men and women are needed for this, and men and women are needed in whom to embody the delegated powers of the nations. In every nation is one person best fitted to serve as its representative. At the present we are singularly favored—we Americans: our most efficient person is known to us. I refer to our President, Theodore Roosevelt.

Already has President Roosevelt achieved for himself a permanent place in history. The great services he has, even so far, rendered the cause of international arbitration and of the world's peace, have determined that. His timely and insistent mediation in the Russo-Japanese war resulted in bringing to a conclusion and to a satisfactory settlement one of the most costly and bloody conflicts in the history of civilization. His work, together with that of President McKinley and John Hay, prevented the partition of China; and during his administration the United States has taken its place among the great world-powers. Besides this, the tendency of his mind and scope of his thought are plainly evinced in his recent sending of Mr. Root on his mission to our sister nations in South America—a mission which will not only assure them of our cordiality and good will, but will tend to bring them into closer relations with one another and ameliorate greatly the industrial, commercial and other conditions prevailing among them, by leading them to the principle of resorting in cases of misunderstanding, not to arms, but to arbitration, thus to a considerable extent directing them into line with the great world-movements,

When Mr. Roosevelt shall have completed his work as Chief Executive, what better cause can he serve than that of the active promotion of universal peace? Our country urgently needs as its representative in the conferences at The Hague a man such as he. It should appoint him, and should empower him unstintedly to act with his confreres from the

other great nations in formulating a plan for international arbitration and federation. He has proved his worth and his capacity. He would attain the end he set out to attain. We hope—nay, we urge, that when the time is opportune, the United States of America constitute him its Permanent Delegate to the International Board of Arbitration, the first Parliament of the Federation of the World.

How better conclude than with the vision of a poet whose insights the world is hastening to verify and confirm to the full? Looking from the past to the future, he noted the progress of humanity from the reign of physical force and compulsion—the day of the brute in man—and saw it culminate in the regnancy of moral suasion and justice—the day of true manhood, when:

“ . . . the war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were
furl'd

In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.”

And going farther—searching to the heart of things with the eye of insight—he prophesies the next step, the elimination of internal, that is, industrial or insurrectionary, strife under the sway of Reason,—the outcome of it all when:

“ . . . the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law.”

—From *The Arena*, Nov., 1907.

Editorial Comment in "The Arena"

The Federation of the World:* In *The Federation of the World*, by WALTER JOHN BARTNETT, a prominent member of the American Society of International Law, our readers will find a broad, statesmanlike paper in which the author shows how mighty forces are rapidly making for world federation. His own position is that of an enlightened statesman who has thought deeply upon the great subject which he discusses. He holds that the true function of government is the advancement of the welfare of all classes; that the great enlightenment of the people of all lands must ultimately result in the greater stability of government; that the principle of government of the people, by the people and for the people is becoming universal; and that the nations are beginning to realize the self-interest that lies in co-operation; while in the various movements already inaugurated which look toward world union along various lines, we have a warrant for believing that "in the course of a few years we shall see the shaping of a true world-movement * * * toward the effectuation of an international understanding embodied in a permanent institution of universal scope." The paper is one that should challenge the attention of all lovers of humanity and human progress.

*The Arena, Nov., 1907.

Andrew Carnegie on the Peace Movement

"I live in the belief that soon men will awaken to the greatest of all duties. We have abolished slavery—the owning of man by man. There remains the greater sin of the killing of man by man.

"Our race has abolished private war—duels—between men and established the rule of law. No man can dishonor another; no nation can dishonor another. All honor's wounds are self-inflicted. Therefore, every civilized man must submit his wrongs to a court of law.

"It devolves upon our race to teach the civilized world that international disputes must likewise be settled by law and the reign of international peace established.

"This is a most propitious time, Christmas eve, when the thoughts of all turn from their daily cares to that peace and good will which leads us to pray:

That come it may, as come it will, for a' that,
That man to man, the world o'er, shall brothers be for a' that.

"Every ruler and every statesman proclaims that the money they spend upon armaments, military and naval, is solely to secure peace, and in this these men are absolutely honest.

"There is not a ruler or statesman in the world to-day who desires war, but while every nation builds its fleets every one of these becomes a menace to other nations because they can easily be converted into instruments of destruction.

"Armaments beget armaments.

"The building of ships arouses suspicion between nations. There is no surety for peace where suspicion dwells.

"If I had my way there would be a meeting called of three or four of the foremost men in each country, instructed to sit down and determine why it is that while every ruler and statesman desires peace, none is able to secure it. This question should be asked of every nation in turn:

“You are earnest in your desire for peace. Why would it not be secured by an agreement such as has been made in regard to marine captures, to allow disputes to be settled by a corresponding Supreme Court? Why would not that give you your heart’s desire? If you do not favor this, why?”

“Let the answer of each nation be recorded that we may see who are really with us and who are against us. The party disagreeing would have to give some reason for unwillingness to adopt the means for securing it. In this movement there is no question but that the leadership belongs to our industrial Republic.

“I believe that if President Taft were to appoint a committee of three commissioned to visit the belligerent nations now increasing their armaments and ask that question the answers would shed a flood of light upon the question. One great step would be gained, for we could point to the party or parties responsible for the continuance of the brutal system of killing each other and appealing to force, which determines not who is right, but simply who is strong. It is difficult to understand how any conscientious man can appeal to such a tribunal.”

“Of all men living and free to take up this cause, Theodore Roosevelt is without a competitor. If any man can discover the true path to international peace it is Theodore Roosevelt. It is, as far as I see, the position most worthy of his past and of his future.

“A few nations, say Germany, Great Britain and the United States—all three of the one Teutonic race—are absolutely necessary, but we should and would have France and others. Soon or late they must come to it. There are evidences in Europe now that the peoples in these countries are not disposed to approve the vast expenditure necessary to build and maintain Dreadnoughts.

“Last year Britain spent on her navy \$345,000,000; Germany, \$223,000,000, and the United States, \$470,000,000, including pension. Here is more money than needed to build

the Panama Canal. There is spent by the United States Government for this purpose more money than sufficient to establish a system of internal water navigation throughout our whole country. Not one particle of return is received from it; on the contrary, the ships rot or become obsolete and worthless.

“Delegates of the eight naval powers—Germany, France, Italy, Russia, Austria-Hungary, Japan, Britain and the United States—sitting in London unanimously agreed to establish an international supreme court to deliver final judgment upon all cases of marine captures, each nation appointing one judge.

“The same powers have only to decree that hereafter disputes between all civilized nations shall be settled in a like manner, or by arbitration, and war would become a thing of the past.

“Opposition must be expected from the professional classes in our army and navy. These may have the support of manufacturers of steel and war material, but these combined will be found of little moment when the people are fully informed.

“The thousands of millions saved by such a plan would necessarily find avenues for investment in other directions, and so far from any branch of trade being injured, it would be replaced tenfold by the necessary investment of capital which is now expended upon war.

“I think the suggestion made to the Foreign Powers for international peace by Secretary Knox, of the State Department, is admirable—a step in the right direction, and I am most anxious to hear the responses. I am glad The American has taken up the subject. It reaches the common people, and after all, it is upon the masses that we must depend.

“In this connection, nothing is more notable than the visits being exchanged between the workingmen of Germany, Britain and France. The warmest friendships are being formed among this class, and the note everywhere is that the laboring men of all others do not want to attack one another. Their

interest can be understood, as they suffer for the necessities of life. Wealth has no such ordeal to endure."

"Do you see any immediate good that will come to the industrial world from such an agreement as proposed between the nations?" Mr. Carnegie was asked.

"I do not see how it can be questioned," came the prompt reply. "If as the figures show, it would save the United States over a million dollars a day, which is producing nothing, and put it into productive enterprises, it goes without the saying it would benefit mankind."

"Do you believe that the reign of peace among men would favorably react upon the relations between the employer and the employed?"

"I feel confident that the reign of peace among men would react upon all ranks and conditions of men; but as long as man tolerates the killing of his fellowmen, we have little hope for the advancement of our race. The end we should aim at is to strengthen the sense of brotherhood between men, and when we teach men that the taking of a man's life is the work only of the savage, life upon this earth will be improved in every aspect.

"It is easy to see," continued Mr. Carnegie, "what the influence of an international agreement for peace would accomplish by simply reviewing a bit of history. Nearly a century ago Canada and the United States agreed that upon the inland seas, which constitute their boundary for hundreds of miles, each should place one 100-ton vessel armed with one 28-pounder. The tiny craft, one flying the Union Jack and the other the Stars and Stripes, have never fired a shot except in friendly salute to each other, and unbroken peace has been preserved.

"If the world had its police force on the seas, there would be the 'protection from assault' which each naval power declares is all it desires and is increasing its navy solely to ensure. There would remain no enemy from whom protection would

be needed. Commerce would be immune. The naval nations would be as one in friendly alliance.

"Never were nations as busy as to-day in the hopeless task of becoming too powerful to be attacked. Britain and Germany are the principal contestants. Britain has a strong case. She cannot feed her people if her food supplies are interrupted on the seas. The fear of starvation would instantly create panic and general pillage of food supplies would ensue. Hence she has claimed she must possess overwhelming fleets and must oppose the great advance which the other Powers urge, the immunity of commerce upon the sea.

"Germany also has a case quite strong enough to give her the support of the nation."

"Do you think the talk of war between Germany and England will now prevent these two Powers from entering into an arrangement such as has been proposed?"

"On the contrary," answered Mr. Carnegie, "I think the alleged animosity between the two countries is largely artificial; that the masses of the people are friendly to each other. The alarm aroused in Britain just now by the leaders of one of the parties is purely political, an attack upon the other party which happens to have the reins of government.

"Mr. Balfour, the leader, although indulging in this effort to alarm people, has just stated that he does not himself believe that the people of Germany and England are desirous of war. It is not the masses of people on either side that we have to fear. These are kindly disposed to each other. It is the military and naval classes in both countries that are at the bottom of the trouble.

"In this movement now started we need not expect the military and naval classes to see their occupations gone without protest. We must expect that. In fact, that note sent to the powers does not suggest disarmament. Every nation is left free to judge for itself what it shall do.

"My opinion is, however, that in the most advanced countries public sentiment would soon decree a decided reduction

of military and naval armament, and as confidence grew among the nations more and more, they would realize the folly of adding to these.

“We have a strong peace party in the United States. Mr. Roosevelt was never able to get more than one-half the amount he asked for the navy, and it is my belief that our Republic would give the nations of the world a salutary lesson in reducing its armaments. I earnestly hope that Secretary Knox will take place as one of the greatest peace ministers of our race.”

On the danger of armaments, Mr. Carnegie had said:

“Nations are only aggregations of men, and the history of man proves the folly of arming themselves in the vain hope of securing immunity from attack. California is one of the most recent examples. Her gold mines attracted hardy adventurers from all parts of the world. Courts of justice were unknown. Each individual resolved to become ‘too powerful to be attacked,’ and armed himself as the best means of securing peace and safety.

“The result was entirely the reverse, as it has proved to be with the nations. The more men armed themselves the greater the number of deadly feuds. There was no peace. Anarchy was imminent, but the best element arose and reversed this policy. At first the Vigilance Committee was formed of the most enlightened citizens, which was soon superseded by the regular courts of law.

“Only when the arming of men was not permitted did the reign of peace begin. Thus was that community led to peace by disarmament, and thus only can international peace be finally established and the nations rest secure under a police force to maintain, never to break, the peace.”

—Reprint from *New York American*.

Outline of the International School of Peace

Read at the Second National Peace Congress, Chicago, 1909.

BY EDWIN GINN, OF BOSTON.

Although man has been obliged to fight from the beginning, yet through the development of ages he has risen in a large measure above the necessity of fighting. Formerly the lord had his castle upon a spur of the mountain for defense against the lawless and against his enemies. This custom was extended and they would signal each to the other when danger threatened. Later it was found to be cheaper and better to settle in a town and to build around it high walls which could not be scaled. But the walled-town stage has long since passed, and we have now reached a state of development where physical force within each nation is applied only as a police force to restrain the vicious and turbulent.

But as between nations the earlier conditions still prevail, and they still act toward each other as barbarians. They are suffering from fear and distrust of each other, almost wholly unwarranted. In fact, each individual nation wishes to be undisturbed in the peaceful development of its own resources. Rarely does one nation desire a conflict with another nation or to encroach upon the territory of another. Each one wishes to live in harmony with the others. Yet our boundary lines are bristling with cannon, the seas are alive with battleships and the tramp of the soldier is heard the world over. And for what purpose? It is not to curb the turbulent and vicious. It is because of a groundless fear of attack from sister nations. Such attacks are not really contemplated and ought not to be expected.

It follows that this enormous expense for armies, this taxation that is draining every year billions from the treasuries of the people and bringing want, sickness, suffering and death to

multitudes, is wholly unnecessary; and the problem of international peace is how to set in motion forces which will end this frightful waste and destruction. I believe that this result can be accomplished by appealing to the enlightened selfishness of mankind and by setting in motion educational forces, which will show the folly of the present status, and will also remove the fear and suspicion which are the main causes of our present wasteful expenditures for armies and navies.

It is our desire to establish a fund that shall be so used as to cause the nations to see that there is a fully adequate substitute for their present armies and navies; so used as to educate the nations to a better knowledge of each other, to have more trust in each other; so used as to make the people of each nation feel that other nations are on the same level and as worthy of confidence as themselves.

But no substantial progress can be made if the effort runs directly counter to the present tendency of thought and action. We must adapt our reform movement to the tendencies of the time, moving along the line of least resistance. The idea of force cannot at once be eradicated. It is useless to believe that the nations can be persuaded to disband their present armies and dismantle their present navies, trusting in each other or in the Hague Tribunal to settle any possible differences between them, unless, first, some substitute for the present force is provided and demonstrated by experience to be adequate to protect the rights, dignity and territory of the respective nations. The idea which underlies the embryonic international supreme court which we now have in the Hague Tribunal is fundamentally good; but the movement is not yet far enough advanced so that the nations can be persuaded to disarm and rest for security upon the decisions of a court having its limited jurisdiction and no power to enforce its decisions. My own belief is that the idea which underlies the movement for the Hague Court can be developed so that the nations can be persuaded each to contribute a small percentage of their military forces at sea and on land to an international guard or

police force. Five per cent. of the present forces would probably be found sufficient. If this is too small certainly ten per cent. of the present armaments would be fully adequate to protect all nations in their rights and to prevent any disorder or turbulence. This plan involves no marked and revolutionary change in the present methods; puts no additional burdens of taxation upon the people; but if tried, it will make the futility and waste of the present method so obvious that disarmament will naturally and inevitably follow, just as disarmament among individuals follows upon the institution and maintenance of an adequate police force. When the nations see, as I think they will, that this international police force is ample to ensure them all their rights, they will be unwilling to bear the present excessive burdens for armament, and disarmament, or at least nine-tenths of it, will come as a natural and inevitable result of a perception of the obvious uselessness of armament.

But the important point to have in mind is that all successful reform movements achieve their success by offering a reasonable and adequate substitute for the erroneous existing system. Such a substitute is found, it seems to me, in this suggestion. The benefits which would accrue to the nations and to the people from such a result are hard to exaggerate. There would no longer be need of any grinding poverty in the land. If the people were freed from the present war expenditure, every man, woman and child could live in comfort and have an opportunity for a good education; hospitals, schools, and churches could be erected wherever there was an occasion; swamps and unhealthy parts of the surface of the earth could be drained, and highways built to connect every habitable part of the globe; railroads, rivers, and canals could furnish transportation for the whole world.

War and the threat and fear of war constitute to-day an economic scourge of almost inconceivable magnitude. Armies are not a protection against war; they are the cause of war. Every battleship launched is a menace to the peace of the

world. We shall never have peace until we bring about disarmament. I reject utterly the argument that large standing armies and navies make for the peace of the nations. We all know that, in a barbaric or half-civilized state of society, most individuals go armed, and that quarrels, maimings and murders are multiplied in consequence. To make peace in the community we prevent individuals from carrying arms intended for the slaughter or injury of their fellow beings. The armed are rarely the peaceful. Precisely so with the nations. The unarmed nation is the really peaceful nation.

The plan which I would follow is somewhat as follows:

(1) There should be established in corporate form an International School of Peace. Such a corporation would be a permanent legal machinery for receiving and disbursing contributions and bequests; for it is an important part of my purpose and hope that the fund which I have provided for should be but the nucleus and beginning of a great endowment contributed by others and perhaps by governments themselves, to forward the great cause.

(2) This International School of Peace, whether incorporated or not incorporated, should have a president, secretary, treasurer and board of managers or directors, making up an executive committee, and constituted of men who are known for their soundness of judgment as well as for their devotion to the public welfare. An Advisory Council, consisting of men eminent in the peace movement and arbitration cause, might well be constituted.

(3) There should be a Bureau of Education which should attempt to modify the courses of study in our schools, colleges and universities by eliminating the use of such literature and history as tend unduly to inculcate the military spirit and to exaggerate the achievements of war. Too much of our history is now devoted to accounts of battles and to the exploits of war heroes; too little respect and attention are directed to the unselfish and self-sacrificing lives of thousands of noble men

and women who have striven and achieved mightily for the benefit of the race in the fields of peace.

The teachers in our schools, academies and colleges should be interested in this movement and trained to see its importance.

International exchange of teachers and students, in accordance with the ideas which underlie the Rhodes Scholarships and the recent exchange of professors between Germany and America, should be further extended, even among the teachers of our public schools. Such interchange of students and of teaching service tends to break down the absurd and unintelligent prejudices which have hitherto existed, to a considerable degree even in our school-rooms, as to the relations and feelings of the people of one race or nation to the people of another race or nation.

Social intercourse among the educators of different nations should be extended in every possible way. "Stranger" and "enemy" always have been nearly, if not quite, synonymous terms.

The circulation of such books as have already been published under the name of "The International Library" should be favored and advanced in every possible way, and the publication and circulation of other books having an analogous purpose and tendency should be encouraged.

So, also, should the co-operation of the clergy be obtained. They should be interested in the peace movement and induced to preach upon the various aspects of the movement and to work among their parishioners, so that they may make their pulpits and lives a real power for "peace on earth and good will towards men." The theological seminaries and other institutions for training preachers and clergymen should be brought to see the importance of this movement and so to frame their courses of study and training as to cause the preachers of the future both to realize and to preach real peace.

Either separately or as a part of this Educational Bureau there should be an organized attempt to influence the press of the world. Facts and arguments tending to show the advantages of peace from an historical and economic standpoint should be gathered and distributed to newspapers and magazines everywhere. An editorial corps, thoroughly trained, should furnish constantly to the press of the world material which would make for peace. One of our present great dangers of war is found in false, misleading and inflammatory statements about international relations, written by irresponsible persons and circulated by sensational newspapers. Such statements should be carefully investigated, and clear, dispassionate explanation and refutation of them made and widely published as speedily as possible, before the evil caused by such newspapers has had time to gather force and spread itself, as hitherto, throughout the world. It ought to be made impossible for any "yellow journal" ever again to be able to boast that it has brought on a war. Prompt and authoritative denials and explanations of these sensational and evil-working publications will not only make them less harmful, but will tend to lessen the profit derived from them and thus to discourage a repetition of the offence.

Our business organizations—chambers of commerce and other similar associations—should be addressed and interested in this question of the burdens of war and of the threat of war. It is absurd that our business organizations should listen with intense interest to a discussion of the effect of the tariff upon business or spend a great amount of time and thought in devising ways for improving, to a slight degree, transportation facilities, and yet entirely overlook the fact that almost, if not quite, the greatest single burden that business is now bearing is the war burden.

A careful study of international relations and the cost of war from both the historic and the economic point of view should be made, and a systematic effort to educate the people everywhere to a thorough knowledge of the terrible scourge

that war and the threat and fear of war are at the present time, not only upon governments, but upon all peoples everywhere. The people should be made to see that if war expenses are to continue to increase in the next few hundred years as they have in the last century, the accumulations of civilization are in danger of being destroyed and the nations made insolvent.

(4) A Political Bureau should be instituted, which should employ men of statesmanlike grasp and power in all the main capitals of the world to watch over the course of legislation and to work for the reduction of armaments. Such men should scrutinize all matters of international relations and strive in every way to prevent trifling causes from exciting international disputes and the war spirit. Many wars should and would be prevented if able, discreet and statesmanlike men were in the capitals of the world watching and working for good understanding and peace.

Again I would appeal to the enlightened selfishness of mankind, and would have men point out how much better it is to come to an understanding of each other's position, to meet each other half way in a friendly and compromising spirit, than either to plunge into war on such trifling occasions as have hitherto caused most of our wars, or to continue the increase of armaments in the hope of terrorizing other nations to submit to any unjust demands that one nation may make upon another.

(5) This International School of Peace should co-operate in every practicable way with all existing forces, agencies and organizations. I am a firm believer in continual activity if anything is to be accomplished. This work has never yet been undertaken in a broad and systematic way. Every avenue for the amelioration of mankind should, so far as possible, be availed of and made to contribute to this movement in behalf of peace. I would have an organization created that should affiliate with and bring all beneficent and benevolent forces to work together for this common cause.

However carefully we may plan for this great work, its success must depend finally upon the *kind* of men and women employed. It is my belief that this organization should aim to secure, first, the most talented persons in their line, men and women who desire especially to devote their lives to the cause, making sure that we have a fund sufficiently large to guarantee them a salary adequate to enable them to do their work effectively and at the same time provide themselves with the ordinary comforts of life. Not only should *able* representatives be sought, but men and women in the prime of life, who can look forward to a reasonable period of activity. In a great many movements too much stress has been placed upon securing those who have already achieved great success in the world. As a rule men do not achieve such success early in life. It comes to them generally as the reward of long years of service, after they have reached their fullest maturity. While I appreciate the advantages of having the co-operation of such as have gained the confidence of the people, I am inclined to think that much of this arduous work should be undertaken by those who have yet twenty or thirty years of vigorous effort to give. It is well to have both classes—those who have been tried in the great battles of life and have won a reputation by their intelligence, wisdom, and calm judgment; those are the men for counsel; but young manhood and womanhood should be sought to do the work.

It is again the story of the bundle of rods. Each in its way has a certain strength and can bear a certain amount of strain, but when these sticks are brought together, they create a force which is irresistible. There are many hundreds of organizations which are doing splendid work for the elevation of mankind, but each is working in its own way. What is needed now is to bring into hearty co-operation all these various forces and make a united stand against this great cloud overshadowing all lands.

In bringing together our *bundle of rods* we should not neglect the men of the armies and navies. Here is a most fruitful

ful field. These men are among the best in the land and would not harm their fellows unnecessarily. The most of them believe that physical force is needful for the protection of one nation against another, and when the military forces believe this, it makes it almost certain that it is. If every one believes that a war is imminent, it is very difficult to avert it. If there were a strong feeling in the hearts of the people of all nations that these preparations for war were not necessary, it would be much easier to do away with them. If we would have war and the preparations for war cease, we must create a sentiment favorable to peace. This is the great problem which is before us for solution.

Above all, every one who enters the ranks should do so because of an all-absorbing interest in the work. I would rather have one, thus equipped, than a hundred of equal ability who were influenced largely by the salary to be obtained. The success of this organization depends upon the enthusiasm we put into it, which must be the enthusiasm of a reformer—a Godfrey, a Savonarola, a Garrison, a Phillips—the kind of white heat that burns when it touches a community.



Letter from Mr. Taft

Read at the Second National Peace Congress, Chicago, 1909.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON, April 28, 1909.

MY DEAR SIR:

I greatly regret that I am unable to attend the coming National Peace Conference at Chicago and there to express my earnest sympathy with the object of the assembling of so many distinguished men in the interest of world peace. That progress has been made in the matter of peace everywhere by international action and by the moral pressure of the peoples of the earth, anyone who has examined the record must admit. It is true that armaments go on increasing in cost, but it is also true that the burdens presented by this competition in armament are growing heavier and heavier, and the problems for solution consistent with their increase become more and more difficult. The possibilities of war now arising come chiefly from irresponsibilities of government, and in those countries where stability of internal control is lacking. The United States has contributed much to the cause of peace by assisting countries weak in respect to their internal government so as to strengthen in them the cause of law and order. This relationship of guardian and ward as between nations and countries, in my judgment, helps along the cause of international peace and indicates progress in civilization. The policy of the United States in avoiding war under all circumstances except those plainly inconsistent with honor or its highest welfare has been made so clear to the world as hardly to need statement at my hands. I can only say that so far as my legitimate influence extends while at the head of this government, it will always be exerted to the full in favor of peace, not only as between this country and other countries, but as between our sister nations.

WILLIAM H. TAFT.

Theodore Roosevelt and the Peace Movement

By WALTER JOHN BARTNETT

The peace of the world is rapidly becoming an economic question affecting the lives of all civilized people. The heavy burden of taxation for army and navy purposes is being felt in all lands. Congressman Tawney has pointed out in a forceful manner that seventy per cent. of our national revenues is being expended during times of peace in preparation for war and to meet the expenses of past wars. Is there any remedy for this condition, and if so, what is it?

The peace of the world reposes in the hands of eight men: the President of the United States, Emperor William, King Edward, the Czar, the President of France, the Emperor of Austria-Hungary, the King of Italy and the Emperor of Japan. At least six of these eight men are peace advocates. The vast majority of the subjects of all of them will now favor universal peace and will support measures that will abolish war.

In times of peace it is costing the nations two thousand million dollars annually to be prepared for war. Of this great sum ten per cent., or \$200,000,000, annually, is sufficient to secure universal peace. How can this be done? By the formation of a federation, or league, of the nations, under limitations, to maintain a court to decide all controversies between nations and endowed with power to enforce its decrees by means of an adequate armament contributed by the signatory states. This Federation would be formed by Articles of Federation assented to by the leading nations. It would be a government of limited sovereignty whose main function would be to establish a court (the Hague Tribunal, if you please) with power to decide all controversies between nations and to enforce its decrees. It would have no jurisdiction to pass laws affecting the domestic affairs of the different nations.

It would not disturb the existing forms of government. The Articles of Federation would be comparatively simple. They would not be as complicated as the constitution of the United States, or as the written constitutions of most of the existing governments. The government of the Federated States would be limited to the grant of powers made to it by the states assenting. It would be supported by contributions to be made by the governments uniting in its establishment. It is estimated that it would require less than \$200,000,000 per annum to maintain it. If this Federation were once established, the great powers would not be obliged to maintain separate armies and navies. A saving could thus be effected to the nations of from \$1,500,000,000 to \$1,800,000,000 per annum.

These ideas are not new. They have been discussed for years by practical men interested in the Hague Conference. They are supported by statesmen of prominence. A few years ago such views would have been deemed visionary, but it must be remembered that the dreams of one decade become the realities of the next; so will it be with this proposition. Secretary Knox is now proposing his Arbitral Court of Justice, an admirable proposition as far as it goes. **The peace of the world cannot be maintained until a court is established that will have jurisdiction and power to determine all controversies between nations and enforce its decrees.**

The revenues of the Federation would probably be secured along lines somewhat similar to those on which the revenues required by the International Institute of Agriculture are secured. This Institute is sustained by the nations. In the establishment and maintenance of this Institute the nations established a precedent which to a great extent can now be followed. The revenues that would be annually required by this Federation would be about those now needed to govern the City of New York. They would be but a fraction of the revenues that are today received by some of the large corporations in the United States. The gross income of the United States Steel Corporation for the year 1909, for instance, amounted to \$646,382,251. The amount paid in wages and salaries during

that year exceeded \$150,000,000. Such a Federation should not be as difficult a task to direct as the affairs of the United States Steel Corporation. To devise Articles of Federation providing for the establishment of a court with power to decide all controversies between nations and devise means whereby such court would have adequate force to carry into effect its decrees, should not prove a formidable task.

It is believed that a special peace commission headed preferably by Theodore Roosevelt, and comprising Andrew Carnegie, Elihu Root, Joseph H. Choate and Richard Bartholdt or men of similar character, could present this or some similar idea to the great powers in such manner as to secure their assent to a practical plan which would eventuate in the disarmament of the nations, thereby materially reducing the expenses of all governments. It is the intention of the World-Federation League and some of the leading peace advocates to ask Congress to authorize President Taft to appoint such a commission.

The World-Federation League is in harmony with the efforts that are now being made by those working in the interests of the Hague Conference. It commends the efforts of Secretary Knox and President Taft to establish a Court of Arbitral Justice. It believes that Congress should empower President Taft to appoint a special peace commission to urge international federation as a means of establishing universal peace. Such a commission could advance Secretary Knox's proposition and probably secure the assent of the leading powers to make it a court that would decide all controversies between nations instead of certain controversies that may be submitted to it. Such a peace commission should not be limited in its scope to any one idea; it should be empowered to consider any suggestion in the interests of universal peace that may be made by other governments. Can anyone doubt that practical results would be obtained if Congress should empower President Taft to appoint such a commission and if Theodore Roosevelt and Andrew Carnegie should become members of it? —Reprint from *New York American*.

A Suggestion from William T. Stead

The immediately pressing thing to do is to get the Powers to agree as to how the Judges of the Supreme Court of International Justice should be chosen, and then to work for an agreement among all the nations that any Power going to war without first appealing to the International Tribunal should be boycotted by all the rest. That is practical politics, for if the United States alone were to refuse to lend money or trade with any belligerent who did not appeal to the Court before drawing the sword, everyone would appeal to the Court, for we cannot afford to do without the United States.

A League of Peace

By ANDREW CARNEGIE

If the principal European nations were not free through conscription from the problem which now disturbs the military authorities of Britain, the lack of sufficient numbers willing to enter the man-slaying profession, we should soon hear the demand formulated for a League of Peace among the nations. The subject of war can never be studied without recalling this simplest of all modes for its abolition. Five nations co-operated in quelling the recent Chinese disorders and rescuing their representatives in Peking. It is perfectly clear that these five nations could banish war. Suppose even three of them formed a League of Peace — inviting all other nations to join — and agreed that since war in any part of the civilized world affects all nations, and often seriously, no nation shall go to war, but shall refer international disputes to the Hague Conference or other arbitral body for peaceful settlement, the League agreeing to declare non-intercourse with any nation refusing

compliance. Imagine a nation cut off to-day from the world. The League also might reserve to itself the right, where non-intercourse is likely to fail or has failed to prevent war, to use the necessary force to maintain peace, each member of the League agreeing to provide the needed forces, or money in lieu thereof, in proportion to her population or wealth. Being experimental and upon trial, it might be deemed advisable, if necessary, at first to agree that any member could withdraw after giving five years' notice, and that the League should dissolve five years after a majority vote of all the members. Further provisions, and perhaps some adaptations, would be found requisite, but the main idea is here.

The Emperor of Russia called the Hague Conference, which gave us an International Tribunal. Were King Edward or the Emperor of Germany or the President of France, acting for their Governments, to invite the nations to send representatives to consider the wisdom of forming such a League, the invitation would no doubt be responded to and probably prove successful.

The number that would gladly join such a League would be great, for the smaller nations would welcome the opportunity.

The relations between Britain, France, and the United States to-day are so close, their aims so similar, their territories and fields of operation so clearly defined and so different, that these Powers might properly unite in inviting other nations to consider the question of such a League as has been sketched. It is a subject well worthy the attention of their rulers, for of all the modes of hastening the end of war this appears the easiest and the best. We have no reason to doubt that arbitration in its present optional form will continue its rapid progress, and that it in itself contains the elements required finally to lead us to peace, for it conquers wherever it is tried; but it is none the less gratifying to know that there is in reserve a drastic mode of enforcement if needed, which would promptly banish war.

—From the *Rectorial Address* of Oct. 17, 1905.

A Christmas Plea for Perpetual and Universal Peace

By JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

For a thousand years the Christmas Festival has been heralded as a harbinger of peace to all the world.

The Angels sang it in swelling chorus on the starlit plains of Bethlehem, and the temples of all Christian nations have echoed through the centuries the ringing anthem of Peace on Earth, Good-will to Men.

Is it not time, at last, that the platitudes of praise and the perpetual paeans to the Prince of Peace should be materialized in some brave and earnest effort to bring actual and practical tranquillity to a striving and a wrangling world?

Surely, out of the world knowledge and the world touch of this twentieth century of Christ, it should be possible to formulate a plan of universal peace.

The triumphs of steam, of electricity and of air have made close neighbors of every earthly kingdom and nation, and the horrors of war are painted red upon the history and the heart of the civilized race.

The time has come when the swords of the nations should be beaten into plough-shares and their spears into pruning hooks, and there should be no wars forevermore.

The Birthday of the Prince of Peace should be the beginning of a millennial calm among the nations.

The way is plain to this supreme and glorious consummation.

Five nations hold in their hands the possibility of universal peace.

If the United States, with England, Germany, Russia and Japan, should join hands to make it, there would never more be wars in all the world.

These nations, saving ours, have in their martial economics the supremest appeal for peace. Every kingdom is a camp, and every circumscribing sea is alive with ships. The standing armies are colossal, and Dreadnought follows Dreadnought in frenzied competition on the seven seas. Starving treasuries and peoples taxed to desperation maintain the gigantic engineering of slaughter, while industry and development lag at the heels of marching soldiery.

The greater kingdoms are going bankrupt in the maintenance of fleets and armies to hold their pre-eminence and their equality in this martial century, and the people are cramped and thwarted in their uplifting struggle toward prosperity and intellectual growth.

The great Republic has scant place among standing armies, and its fleet is not the first. This newspaper has fought for a mighty navy, so long as it was the spirit of the times to have one. If great navies are to represent the nations of the earth, we have held it essential and vital that our own should be the first, or equal to the first. But always our plea for battleships has been not for war, but as the wisest and most effective agency for preserving and compelling peace.

The "American" has always hoped and always planned for the era when fleets and armies should be permanently disbanded, and the fierce disputes of nations should be settled in the arbitrament of disinterested states. We have believed that the time would come when navies and armies shall be no longer necessary, when nations disposed to fight shall be wholesomely restrained, and when the appeal to arms shall pass from the history of men.

The "American" believes that this is the psychological moment in the history of the world to sound the appeal for Universal Peace.

There is not a nation in existence which does not fervently desire it and would not join in any great movement wisely presented that gave promise of success.

Why should not America take the initiative in this Millennial Enterprise? The youngest of nations and the greatest, free from the jealousies and wrangles of European or Asiatic countries, sitting in splendid isolation and in splendid tranquillity, the obligation of history and of opportunity is upon us to make the move.

Let the heart and the brain of our great wise President revolve the scheme under the noble inspiration of this Christmas time. Let the millionaires and the philosophers make ready their mighty purses and their potential pleas to give it sinews and acceptance among the thinkers and powers that rule the age.

In the April "Independent," Henry Granger, an American engineer, suggested that Theodore Roosevelt should be called home from Africa to lead this evangel among the five great nations of the world.

The suggestion is full of power and force. The ex-President is perhaps the most popular individual citizen of the world. More than any other single man would he find access and a kindly hearing with William of Germany, who needs most to be converted to this great idea. With the German Emperor in accord, Edward of England, the Emperor of Russia and the Mikado of Japan would doubtless fall willing into line, and the great work would be done.

Add to Theodore Roosevelt other great men of our own and other countries—Andrew Carnegie and Congressman Bartholdt, the noblest names of England, of Germany, of Russia and Japan—and the spirit of this mightiest of propagandas would move the world.

The navies of the five nations reduced to proportionate force might make the police patrol of all the seven seas. The other battleships might be contributed to the merchant marine

of each. The vast armies held in reserve might be disbanded, and the enormous revenue that holds them might be consecrated to the development of great public enterprises and to the education of the children of the nations.

The Hague Conference, enlarged and magnified and glorified, might become the arbiter of all national disputes.

And the reign of peace would be established on the earth.

The plan is neither visionary nor impractical.

The very thought of it as a possibility is enough to inflame the imagination, and that half ensures its achievement.

The time is ripe for it, and it is in accord with the magnificent spirit of the advancing age.

It is the most splendid and Christian impulse that ever stirred a Christmas season.

Will President Taft rise to the greatness of the first stately step?

Summon Roosevelt home and commission him to the illustrious work.

—From *New York American*, Dec. 23, 1909.

Who Shall Lead the World to the World's Desire

As the old year of 1909 closes with the dream of Universal Peace, let the new year of 1910 be born with the aspiration renewed and emphasized in action.

In the eager rush of the holidays the plan of uniting the five great nations with our own in a great peace pact to disband the standing armies of the world and police the seven seas with an international fleet found entrance to the heart and judgment, but the busy hands of philanthropy were too steeped in personal charities to take hold in deed.

Now the old year goes, the holidays are spent, and the great nations facing the new year can write no higher and more glorious resolution than that wars shall be no more.

The whole world is weary of standing armies, the burden of war taxes and the threat of blood.

Europe spends \$1,500,000,000 every year in keeping prepared for slaughter. A million and a half of men are kept in barracks who might be producing, or bettering the world. Three hundred millions of our own American money is dedicated annually to the prophecy of slaughter.

Why cannot the world's desire find great men to lead it to glorious consummation?

Seven great men at this stage of civilization have only to join hands to establish and perpetuate the peace of the world.

Roosevelt and Taft, Edward of England and William of Germany, Nicholas of Russia, Fallieres of France and the Mikado of Japan have only to stand shoulder to shoulder, pledging their hearts and hands to this one incomparable vast philanthropy, and the battle of the centuries is already won.

Magnificent opportunity! Majestic responsibility!

How can these great men fail to see and meet the immortal duty which the new year lays in their grasp?

The President of the United States can bring these men together. This great land of Peace has a Peace President, whose fame is wholesome everywhere. He has a predecessor whose name rings magnetic and inspiring round the world. If President Taft would rejoice the world with a Peace Proclamation while the great year is young. If Theodore Roosevelt would come home to carry the evangel to his great fellows across the seas. If Andrew Carnegie, president of the Peace Society, would say that the capital of the country will be pledged to furnish every dollar needed to finance the mighty enterprise, this sunlit new year of 1910 would mark the first stately step toward the realization of the world's millennial hope.

—From *New York American*, Dec. 25, 1909.

Articles of Federation *for the* Federated States of the World

By OSCAR T. CROSBY

Author of "Tibet and Turkestan"

Is it visionary? Yes.

All progress is made of visions which, slowly or suddenly, shape themselves, crystallize into realities.

If the change be sudden we usually find that the magic wand which waved the shadows into substance was a sword. 'Tis a pen that works the slower transformation.

For years the federation of American colonies was a vision, seen only by "impractical" men.

Unified Italy floated, iridescent in the clouds of thought, long before the material sun shone on Victor Emmanuel's crown.

The splendid fabric of the German Empire was woven in the dreams of millions of men ere a man of blood and iron declared that the great day of realization had come.

Yes, it is visionary, now—this Constitution of the Federated States of the World.

Once in all the western "world" of that day, when the spoken word in Rome was obeyed on the wild Danube and in Africa's deserts, men breathed a universal peace, and were happy in it. But savagery dwelt on the borders, and tyranny ruled within. Destruction came; darkness and disorder fell upon Europe; yet the dream, which had been a reality, never vanished utterly from men's minds.

When France became a light unto European civilization, even the practical Henry of Navarre saw a vision of unity which vanished only as the assassin struck his life away.

Napoleon's great mind revived the mighty plan.

Almost did his sword hew the plan into fixed form. To-day, it is Democracy's dream.

The vision is wider, too. Europe is no longer "the world." Now we know that the Chinese Emperor, Eastern Asia's "Elder Brother," has been for ages and to millions of men as a sign of the dream come true.

To-day Europe, Asia, Africa, America, discover a brotherhood that is bounded only by the unpeopled seas.

From all lands an harmonious note is sounded. Only an undertone as yet, it is often drowned by the harsh cry of War, or it is stifled by the incoherent utterance of Prejudice and Ignorance. Yet the undertone persists. A little louder, a little sweeter, a little more dominant, it swells and gives character to the great tumultuous song of human life. Years must be added unto years, hopes unto hopes, labors unto labors, tears unto tears, ere the dream come true.

Of all universal Peace Societies the Government of the United States should be the most effective.

* * * * *

The Resolutions which are now suggested to be passed by our Congress would give to the peace movement a platform, a rallying cry, a flag, an organization.

There are members Quixotic enough, far-seeing enough, to insure the introduction of these or similar Resolutions. Sneers, praises, criticisms, would follow.

It would then remain in our great Democracy, for men and women throughout the land, as citizens, as legislators, as judges, as members of a thousand societies. to speak their convictions on the high subject of International Peace. Congress, in the last analysis, utters the will of the people. If then the people adopt such Resolutions, they must soon become the official voice of a mighty nation offering its strength in the service of Peace.

Although our country was once desclated by four years of dreadful war, which no pact of union could forbend, we yet bless the work of our fathers.

We know that the decree of peace and co-operation among thirteen separate States—even though that decree was once violated—has borne fruit of happiness a thousand-fold more valuable than were the sacrifices required for making our Union.

So, would our children's children bless such work of peace as we to-day may do or plan, even though that work, in some great future strife, should show its human imperfections.

Let us then try to give substance to the dream. Let us ask the vision to speak, not only of its object (that is in our hearts), but of its manner of being (that must be in our brains).

Proposed Joint Resolutions of the Congress of the United States of America

Whereas, means of communication now exist which give to the people of all nations a larger understanding of their common interests than they could heretofore have had; and

Whereas, such mutual understanding and its resultant sympathy between men of all countries does in fact provide the moral basis for a citizenship of the world; and

Whereas, this universal citizenship requires an organ of expression and of action to the end that it may bear proper fruit in preventing the desolations of war and in promoting human happiness through peaceful co-operation of states;

Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

That the treaty-making authority of this government be recommended to proceed promptly to the negotiation of international agreements through which may be established a confederation of the sovereign states entering into such agreements;

And be it further resolved, in pursuit of the great objects of this Resolution, that the Congress of the United States hereby give public expression to a form of Constitution, which in substance as below set forth it recommends to the states of the world as a fitting instrument for realizing world-wide aspirations toward the amelioration of harsh conditions now suffered by multitudes, and which, in part, are due to an ever-present fear of international war.

Proposed Articles of Federation of the Federated States of the World

Article I. The object of this Union is declared to be the abolition of war, and the furtherance of peaceful co-operation between the states signatory to this Constitution.

Article II. The sovereign government created by the adoption of this Constitution shall be known as The Federated States of the World; its powers shall be those herein defined, and none others.

Article III. Sec. 1. For the exercise of all the powers herein granted, there shall be organized a body to be known as the International Court. It shall be composed of representatives of the member-states of this Union.

Sec. 2. The number of such representatives shall be determined as follows:

From each of the following states: The United States of America, Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Italy, Spain, Austria-Hungary, Turkey, China, Japan, three members, plus such number as may be determined by the provisions of Section 5, this article.

Sec. 3. From each of the following states and groups of states: Mexico, Brazil, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, the Argentine Republic, Chili, Persia, Portugal; the groups of states, as follows: first group, Sweden and Norway; second group,

Servia, Roumania, Bulgaria; third group, Colombia, Panama, Venezuela, Bolivia; fourth group, Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa-Rica, Salvador, Guatemala, two members, plus such members as may be determined by the provisions of Section 5, this article.

Sec. 4. From each of the following states and groups of states: Abyssinia, Switzerland, Greece, Siam, Afghanistan, Peru, group of Paraguay and Uruguay, one member plus such members as may be determined by the provisions of Section 5, this article.

Sec. 5. From each state (except China) named in Section 2, this article, one member for every ten million inhabitants in excess of thirty millions; from each state or group of states named in Section 3, this article, one member for every ten million inhabitants in excess of twenty millions; from each state named in Section 4, this article, one member for every ten million inhabitants in excess of ten millions; for China, one member for every fifty million inhabitants in excess of two hundred millions; provided that in the enumeration of inhabitants for the purposes of this article no account shall be taken of any persons held in slavery, or of inhabitants of colonies or protectorates not self-governing.

Sec. 6. The membership based upon population shall, during the first ten years of the exercise of this Constitution, be taken as follows:

For the United States of America, six members.

For Great Britain and its dependencies, two members.

For Austria-Hungary, two members.

For the German Empire, three members.

For the Russian Empire, seven members.

For China, four members.

For Japan, two members.

For France, one member.

At the end of the said period of ten years, and thereafter every tenth year, the Court shall inquire into and fix, for the purposes of representation in this Union, the populations of the member-states.

Article IV. Sec. 1. The pay of members shall be thirty thousand dollars per annum.

Sec. 2. The manner of selection, the personal qualifications, and the term of office of members shall be such as may be determined by their respective governments.

Article V. Sec. 1. The first place of meeting of the Court shall be at The Hague, in Holland. This meeting shall take place, and the conditions of this Constitution shall become operative, one year from the date when all of the following named states may have adopted and signed these articles of union, viz., The United States of America, Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia.

Sec. 2. During a period of five years after the first year of the exercise of this Constitution, the Court may sit in such capitals of member-states as it may select. During the same period of five years, the Court shall endeavor to obtain sole sovereignty of an area not exceeding ten miles square, and there fix its seat of government; and if it should not succeed in obtaining such sole sovereignty, the Court shall thereafter have its sittings wherever it may determine, provided, however, the persons of members of the Court shall always be inviolable when journeying to and from, or in attendance upon, sittings of the Court.

Article VI. Sec. 1. The rules of procedure of the Court shall be such as from time to time may be fixed by it, provided, however, that a majority vote of the members shall always be required for the following purposes, viz.:

1. For adopting, or altering, rules of procedure.
2. For rendering final decision in any dispute between member-states.
3. For authorizing the use of violence by the armed forces of the Court.
4. For determining the sums required for meeting the expenses of the operations of the Court.
5. For electing a President and Vice--President (who shall be members) and for defining their powers and term of office.

6. For passing upon the credentials of members whose right to recognition as such may be in dispute.

Sec. 2. Communication between the Court and the member-states shall be carried on by their respective executives, unless other officials be especially appointed thereto by the Court or the member-states.

Sec. 3. The Court shall cause to be printed in French, with reasonable promptness, and to be furnished to the member states, full reports of its decisions, whether judicial or executive, but its deliberations may be made public or not as the Court may decide.

Article VII. The powers of the Court shall be as follows:

Sec. 1. To decide by decree all disputes submitted to it by any state (whether a member or not) and arising between a member-state and any other state (whether a member or not). Such decision may be made upon the evidence presented by the state submitting the dispute, if, within such period as may be fixed by the Court, the other state or states concerned, having been admonished thereto by the Court, shall have failed to present other evidence.

Sec. 2. To enforce by arms the execution of its decrees, the fulfilment of demands made in accordance with this Constitution, and the exercise of all powers granted herein.

Sec. 3. To repel any attack, or to repress preparations therefor, by any state against any member-state.

Sec. 4. To aid any member-state, upon request of such state, in the suppression of rebellion.

Sec. 5. To establish, maintain, and control such civil organization and such armed force on land and sea as the Court may deem necessary. Conscription of the armed personnel shall be effected, when necessary, through demand made upon the member-states, for numbers of men fixed in the ratio of the relative populations of the states. And for this purpose the population shall be determined in the manner specified in Section 5, Article III.

Sec. 6. To determine annually the sums required for meeting the expenses of the government hereby constituted;

to demand of each member-state payment of its due proportion of said sums, the apportionment among the states to be made in the ratio which the number of representatives of each state may bear to the total number of members of the Court on the first day of July of the year for which the apportionment is made.

Sec. 7. To acquire and hold such lands, buildings, docks, anchorages, and rights of way as may be necessary for the efficient maintenance of its civil and military establishment. Such acquirement may be effected through purchase, gift, or demand made upon any member-state for the exercise by it of its right of eminent domain in respect to property desired and which can not otherwise be had on conditions satisfactory to the Court.

Sec. 8. To demand of member-states that, within three months from the date when this Constitution shall become effective, they shall surrender to the control of the Court all armed vessels of war and all material appurtenant thereto; to select from such surrendered vessels and material whatever the Court may desire to retain in its naval establishment; to disarm the remaining vessels, and to return them, with material not desired, within six months from the date of their surrender; to demand of member-states that they shall not build armed vessels of war; to demand that, within one year from the date when this Constitution shall become effective, the standing armies of all member-states shall be reduced to a footing of one soldier for each thousand inhabitants, determined according to the provisions of Section 5, Article III., and provided that land forces maintained solely for service in colonies not self-governing shall not be subject to the restrictions of this article; to demand of each member-state such portion of its material for land forces as the Court may require; to value all vessels and material retained by the Court under the provisions of this article, and to pay for the same within ten years from the date of its acquirement; to demand the disarmament of fortifications fronting the land frontiers between member-states; to occupy, maintain, alter or disarm

sea-coast fortifications of member-states, and fortifications fronting the frontiers between member-states and other states.

Sec. 9. To make terms of peace which shall be binding upon all member-states affected, in order to conclude any war waged between the forces of the Court and those of any state, provided that no war shall be terminated by a peace-treaty objectionable to any member-state so long as such state continues to furnish to the Court men and material of war sufficient for the vigorous conduct of military operations.

Sec. 10. To propose to states for their consideration methods of promoting the common good of mankind in literature, science, art, and commerce.

Sec. 11. To recognize any sovereign state that may hereafter come into existence, and to fix the number of representatives in the Court to which such state should be entitled as a member of this Union.

Article VIII. An amendment to this constitution shall have full force and effect as a part of it when it shall have received the assent of three-fourths of the members of the Court and of two-thirds of the member-states, provided that for the purposes of this article each group of states named in Article III. shall be taken as one state.



A Constitution of the World

The signatory nations to the following convention, desiring to form a union for the purpose of establishing justice and of securing for themselves as well as for posterity the blessings of permanent peace, do ordain the following Constitution:

1. There shall assemble in the year 1915, and every fifth year thereafter, at The Hague, unless otherwise ordered by three-fourths of the signatory Powers, a General Assembly of the Nations.

2. Each nation shall be entitled to be represented in this Assembly by not less than two or more than seven persons chosen by each nation in such manner and for such a term as may seem to it expedient.

3. Each nation shall have one vote in the General Assembly of the Nations.

4. The territorial and political integrity of each nation represented in the Assembly shall be respected by all nations represented.

5. No nation represented in the Assembly shall acquire exclusive commercial rights with any nation outside of this union, and there shall be no transfer of political control over territory included in the union without the sanction of the Assembly.

6. Each nation shall treat all other nations on equal terms in matters of commerce, whether they be or be not represented in the General Assembly of the Nations; except that any nation can impose duties on the goods of any other nation equivalent to such other nation's duties on its goods.

7. While remaining in the Assembly, each nation shall have the right to arm itself and use its forces according to its own judgment, save as it may have agreed to resort to arbitration. But the armed forces of all the nations represented

in the Assembly shall be at the service of the Assembly for the enforcement of decrees rendered by the International Court at The Hague according to recognized principles of law and under the provisions of treaties of arbitration.

8. The members of the Executive Council and of the Inter-parliamentary Union when designated by the respective parliaments of the nations comprised in this union shall be an International House of Representatives, and it shall sit at least three months during each period of five years.

9. Any general principles accepted by both this International House of Representatives and by the Assembly shall become international law, unless vetoed within three years by one-fourth of the nations' parliaments represented in this union.

10. Any nation may withdraw from the union at its pleasure.

—Reprint from *The Independent*.

Roosevelt—A Suggestion

By HENRY G. GRANGER

Member Am. Inst. Mining Engineers.

Member Am. Soc. Engineering Contractors.

All the countries of Europe, and even Japan, are increasing their military forces. China is undertaking to drill the greatest army of history. A few decades more and it seems that every man at work will carry on his back a soldier.

We, England, Germany, France and Japan are tremendously increasing our navies. As one adds a Dreadnought another adds two, and the others out-Dreadnought the Dreadnoughts with floating fortresses still more huge and consuming still more labor and cash. Spain and Russia, struggling in poverty, squeeze and build battleships. Italy, too, with woful internal problems, lets her people starve and launches cruisers. The more each does the more the others feel they must do—we, too, tho our revenues are down, must spend on our navy alone \$118,000,000 per year with specific increases.

What for? To organize expeditions to relieve congestion and conquer the wilderness, and replace the tracks of lions and rhinos with the footprints of happy, civilized children? Or to attack the problems presented by the laws of nature that ever beckon with hints of new and greater discoveries? No, none of this; just to be ready on an instant's notice to kill people, to destroy the principal element whose constant increase under well-ordered conditions is the main factor of progress and prosperity.

With the ever-increasing expenditure that produces nothing useful, what is the answer? What is the inevitable, inescapable conclusion?

They'll all "go broke," every country of them.

Colombia is one of the greatest sections of the globe in natural resources. It is a country whose men are brave, brilliant and industrious, whose women are beautiful, betwitching and true.

Less than a decade ago Colombia had, in proportion to its revenues, the greatest standing army on earth. No public employee could count on his salary, the interest was not paid on its debt save such parts as had specific revenues pledged. Schools were closed for lack of funds. Want and desperation were everywhere. The country was "broke."

Now things there have changed. Every one is paid on time and in full. Colombia's credit is soaring. Three times as many schools as ever are open. Many night schools are educating the workers. Every mail brings word of a new railroad or other industry finished or begun. The national telegraph service is superior to ours. Peace and progress are showing their effects thruout the land.

Why?

Because in the crisis ensuing on the rape of the Isthmus, Rafael Reyes was given the reins of government. Himself a diplomat of the first order, and regarded even by his political opponents as, next to Diaz, Spanish-America's greatest, keenest statesman, he surrounded himself by such an economist as Calderon, such a thinker as Garces, such a man of iron as De Castro.

Reyes discharged half of the army, and put the other half with mattock, pick and shovel, to building roads, repairing the telegraph, improving sanitation. He raised the pay of the soldiers; but he got results, and supported no parasites. Everything was permitted only as it added or promised to add to the country's prosperity—and the results are showing in the devotion of a people to whom his severest threat is that of resignation, used only to carry difficult points—and always effective.

Theodore Roosevelt can see a point as quickly as any man. He is game to the core. If I did not know it before, I knew it on receipt of his instantaneous reply, that hangs before me as I write, to the letter I wrote him on February 16th questioning some features of his last canal message.

A big dose of salts under certain conditions is very good for the system, tho unpleasant while in action. Many of us who were compelled to mark time while financial conditions readjusted themselves are glad that Roosevelt is succeeded by a man no less able, but whose energy is curbed by judicial habit and diplomatic experience. But we recognize that the strenuous shaking that Roosevelt gave the country was for its great and everlasting good, and uprooted evils that, undisturbed, would have led to destruction. We know that because of Roosevelt neither capital nor labor will ever rule the country. Silently accumulating dividends can never control its destinies. Fair methods *must* prevail.

Hunting excursions, authorship, lectures will soon pall on a man of his stupendous energy and ability. He has run too big a game ever to sit quietly for long and play hearts or old maid. It would kill him. Theodore Roosevelt left office the country's idol—unquestionably the most popular man in the world to-day. With proper channels to work in no man in history ever had the chance to do the great good that it is now in Roosevelt's power to do.

For a score of wild horses hitched to a log to get anywhere, it is necessary for them to stop, look and listen, and all pull in the same direction. They're all willing if shown how. It takes the guiding hand to get the result. It takes the strong trained driver—the man who, as occasion demands, can gently pat a shoulder and say "good old hoss," or, if circumstances require, use his whip.

The nations of the world all want enduring guarantee of peace, respect for their boundaries, a fair hearing and just decision on their claims. Every country wants to tear down

its accurst military and naval expenditure, but doesn't dare because the others won't.

If we could grease and tie up nine-tenths of our fleet, put nine-tenths of our sailors to work at harbor and river improvement at proper pay, the sight of the flying dirt and the feeling of "doing something" would keep the men happy and content and glad to make their practice cruise in due turn. There would be no more sickening monotony of present peace service, prolific of desertions and imprisonment. The money spent would be at compound usury for the country's prosperity. Instead of advertising for recruits there would be a waiting list of eager applicants, as in the civil service and the canal force.

With the armies and navies of the world reduced to simple police service, with assured safety, an era of wonderful and enduring progress and prosperity will immediately ensue.

How can it be done?

The dream of an International Congress, which now has its beginnings in the Hague conventions, can be made real, present and effective. America, England, France, Germany and Japan agreed to it, and the others *must*. This consolidation is out of Morgan's line and beyond him. This world reforming consolidation can be effected. America and any two ensure the other two and thus the rest follow. Roosevelt has not only "the time, the money and the inclination" to do what he believes right, but in this case he has the energy, the prestige and the ability.

If Roosevelt will tackle the proposition he can accomplish a greater feat than any other man ever had the opportunity to undertake, and the like of which, if he does it, no other man can ever have again.

With the knowledge that Theodore Roosevelt is willing to dedicate himself to this, the greatest work of the ages, it would not appear difficult for President Taft to bring about, with the governments of the other leading powers mentioned,

a conference of delegates. This conference would draw up a basis of international constitutional government to cover the questions of boundaries, arbitration, sanitation and police. The central government would control the navies of the world, except such vessels as are needed for customs coast guards in each country, and have entire direction of the forces of the nations, both naval and military for world police service.

The basis drawn up at the conference would be submitted to the approval of each country, and then the congress would be elected under it, with Roosevelt the World President, and America's delegation, including Andrew Carnegie and Congressman Bartholdt. Eternal peace would thus be assured, and in the midst of uninterrupted and uninterruptable prosperity, and the development of commerce, shipping and all the vast natural resources that invite brains and energy to become great factors in civilization, the gruesome era of wars would become but a memory.

—Reprint from *The Independent*.

The Task of Mr. Roosevelt.

An Editorial Reprint from 'The Independent.'—April 29, 1909

We are specially interested in the suggestion made by Mr. Henry G. Granger in our issue of last week that a great task, which no living man could attempt so hopefully, be undertaken by Mr. Roosevelt. It is one that need interfere with no other energy or engagement of his, but which might yet be the grandest monument of his energetic history.

To Mr. Roosevelt while President of the United States was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his labors as intermediary in the negotiations between Russia and Japan. That successful achievement would pale before such a success as Mr. Granger believes would be possible. He would have the United States ask Great Britain, France, Germany and Japan to join with it in compelling and ensuring the peace of the world thru the Hague Conference. As the chief Commissioner, assigned to the task of securing such an agreement of the five nations, the five strongest nations in the world, he would have Mr. Roosevelt named. His best energy and his immense prestige would find in this effort the noblest object to be achieved for civilization.

We do not think such an attempt hopeless. The union of the nations at The Hague seemed impossible a dozen years ago. We are making as rapid progress in public sentiment toward the establishment of a Parliament of the Nations as we are in the suicidal enlargement of our navies and armies. What with the latest scramble for Dreadnoughts, to be followed by a similar insane rivalry for war-fleets in the air, the financial ability even of the wealthiest nations approaches paralysis. The time is ripe for accomplishing the ultimate purpose of advocates of universal peaceful arbitration. There

is needed chiefly a leader who will have the splendid enthusiasm, energy and faith which characterize Mr. Roosevelt.

Think of the purpose in view, nothing less than the assured end of all wars. If the United States, Great Britain and either one of the three other great Powers could be persuaded to unite in this plan, the two others would be bound to follow, and then all the rest of the world. Then the expenditures, thousands of millions of dollars annually by the nations for destructive war and waste, would be immediately reduced to the minor needs of police service, and would be partly devoted to the expansion of internal improvements, roads, waterways, education, improvement of the condition of the people, and mainly remitted to relieve the grinding taxation. Then government the world over might be for the benefit of the people, and not for the purposed injury of each other. There is no higher object that could be set before a statesman and a passionate lover of mankind; and we know of no man who could better attempt this not hopeless task than Theodore Roosevelt. The very thought of it as a possibility is enough to inflame the imagination, and that half ensures its achievement.

Permanent Peace the World's Need

By HENRY G. GRANGER

Peace, assured, permanent peace among all nations, is the recognized most urgent need of the world to-day.

To insure peace the great nations have burdened themselves with huge and ever growing armaments, each necessary by reason of the other's increasing fighting strength, until the situation has become supremely, ridiculously illogical and economically intolerable.

We waste annually \$300,000,000 of our national revenues for guarding against imaginary wars. Europe wastes each year \$1,500,000,000 for the same futile reason, and keeps under arms a million and a half of men, of their brightest and strongest.

The economic loss to the world through the non-productive occupation of Europe's 1,500,000 men under arms at only a dollar a day wages for each man would mean the great yearly total of \$450,000,000, in addition to the loss from useful channels of the labor of 5,000,000 men required to earn the billion and a half dollars annually wasted in war preparations!

The time has arrived to stop this terrific waste and to preclude the possibility of international bloodshed and insure the complete triumph of reason.

Permanent peace and international disarmament have, perforce of economic circumstance, become the live topic of the day. Every nation wishes it.

For some of the foremost, economic disaster is the inevitable result of a slight prolongation of the present situation. For all, the present status is a curse.

If a conclave is called to decide on a basis of international government, in which conference all of the nations participate, it will assuredly become the theatre for endless oratory and inextricable confusion of plans.

To carry through an effective programme of peace it must be done on a business basis. The working plan must be agreed upon by a caucus of the leaders. Whatever is agreed upon by America, the British Empire, Germany, France, Japan and Russia is sure to meet the requirements of the rest of the brotherhood of nations at the start.

In all great movements the right men of the right minds are as important as the right measures. William R. Hearst's world-wide publication of John Temple Graves's Christmas Peace editorial has started, and the same publications with their millions of circulation continue, the greatest propaganda ever undertaken, in the most extensive modern medium of publicity.

Theodore Roosevelt has already won the Nobel prize for peace work. No man excels him in good will for his fellow man. No man surpasses him in sincerity of purpose or height of ideals. No living man has had such fitting experience for the task. No man is better fitted in age and strength and exuberant energy for such a titanic task. Of Roosevelt as the man to carry through international peace Carnegie said, "He is the only individual likely to succeed, and I believe he could."

Theodore Roosevelt will not shirk the greatest task man ever had or ever can have again until the end of time.

The skeleton of an international constitution can be drawn as the fruit of the acute legal minds of our great American lawyers.

International courtesy alone would compel the few other leading nations to heed the official request of the President of the United States. With the greatest readiness will they respond to his call on the matter the satisfactory solution of which solves all their problems.

When William Howard Taft calls on Britain, Germany, France, Japan and Russia to name each six or ten delegates to join America in drawing up an international constitution to cover such international questions as sanitation, arbitration, boundaries, extradition, postal service and the establishment of The Hague Court with plenary powers, and, of course, an executive to enforce its decrees through the international police service that should have complete charge of all armament, except as required for customs coast guards—when President Taft issues this call the response will be immediate and favorable.

Never has a President entered the White House better qualified for the great office. Never has a President had comparable opportunity of achievement with that which beckons President Taft.

—From *New York American*, Jan. 3, 1910.

The Proposed High Court of Nations

By JAMES L. TRYON

Assistant Secretary of the American Peace Society

An international court was one of the first ideas proposed in the practical program of the world peace movement. As early as 1840 the constitution and functions of such an institution were worked out by William Ladd, the founder of the American Peace Society. This legal preventive of war was afterwards urged by the Peace Society and in later years was predicted by Edward Everett Hale as sure to be realized. But not till the first Hague Conference met in 1899 did an International Arbitration Court come into existence. The Permanent Court of Arbitration, as it is technically called, though popularly known as the Hague Court, settled the Pious Fund case, the Venezuela Preferential Payment case, the Japanese House-Tax case and the dispute between Great Britain and France over their treaty rights in Muscat, passed upon the Casablanca incident, adjusted the dispute between Norway and Sweden as to their maritime frontier, and has pending before it the fisheries dispute between the United States and Great Britain, and the Oronoco Steamship case between the United States and Venezuela.

That the court has been a success on the whole is beyond question. * * * The fact that nearly a hundred arbitration treaties, including twenty-four made by the United States, pledge most of the nations to refer certain classes of disputes to it, shows that it has won public confidence and has, to a large degree, become fixed in the life of the world. But besides this court, which is actually in service, are two others, both of them projected by the second Hague Conference, that may also go into operation when certain formalities are complied with or certain necessities arise.

One of these is the International Prize Court, which is for the adjudication of cases of capture of neutral merchant ships and cargoes in time of war, a code for which was made at the Naval Conference held in London in 1909, but is not yet ratified by the nations that are parties to it.

The other is the Court of Arbitral Justice, also called the Judicial Arbitration Court, which is for the same kind of cases that now go to the Permanent Court of Arbitration.

It is the Court of Arbitral Justice, an institution that is known to but comparatively few American people, and that may easily be confused in the popular mind with the present Hague Court, to which I wish to call attention.

But why, it may be asked, should we have a new court when we already have one that is successful and acceptable? The answer reveals the wonderfully rapid growth of the peace cause within the past decade, and is of special interest to lawyers because it is they who, coming to the aid of the movement, are responsible for the proposition. * * *

The progress which has been made toward the court is due primarily to the efforts of three great American lawyers, ex-Secretary Root, Prof. James Brown Scott and Hon. Joseph H. Choate, especially the two first named. All who attended the opening session of the National Peace Congress in New York in 1907, which was organized for the purpose of bringing public sentiment to bear on the Hague Conference, will remember the profound impression made by Mr. Root's address. In it occurred these significant passages, which may be taken as the foundation ideas of the proposed court:

"In the general field of arbitration we are surely justified in hoping for a substantial advance, both as to scope and effectiveness. It has seemed to me that the great obstacle to the universal adoption of arbitration is not the unwillingness of civilized nations to submit their demands to the decision of an impartial tribunal; it is rather an apprehension that the tribunal selected will not be impartial."

Mr. Root quoted in support of his position a despatch that Lord Salisbury sent to Sir Julian Pauncefote March 5, 1896, in which the difficulty of selecting impartial judges from a panel of arbitrators, on account of popular sympathy for one side or the other, is pointed out.

“The feeling which Lord Salisbury so well expressed is, I think,” said Mr. Root, “the great stumbling-block in the way of arbitration. The essential fact which supports that feeling is, that arbitrators too often act diplomatically rather than judicially; they consider themselves as belonging to diplomacy rather than to jurisprudence; they measure their responsibility and their duty by the traditions, the sentiments and the sense of honorable obligation which have grown up in centuries of diplomatic intercourse, rather than by the traditions, the sentiments and the sense of honorable obligation which characterize the judicial departments of civilized nations. Instead of the sense of responsibility for impartial judgment which weighs upon the judicial officers of every civilized country and is enforced by the honor and self-respect of every upright judge, an international arbitration is often regarded as an occasion for diplomatic adjustment. Granting that the diplomats who are engaged in an arbitration have the purest motives, that they act in accordance with the policy they deem to be best for the nations concerned in the controversy; assuming that they thrust aside entirely in their consideration any interests which their own countries may have in the controversy, or in securing the favor or averting the displeasure of the parties before them—nevertheless it remains that in such an arbitration the litigant nations find that questions of policy and not simple questions of fact and law, are submitted to alien determination, and an appreciable part of that sovereignty which it is the function of every nation to exercise for itself in determining its own policy is transferred to the arbitrators.”

Mr. Root illustrates his view by reference to the satisfactory settlement by arbitration of disputes among South American States, the arbitrators of which were detached from inter-

national politics and confined themselves to the merits of the questions before them, "as a trained and upright judge decides a case submitted to his court."

"What we need for the further development of arbitration," added Mr. Root, "is the substitution of judicial action for diplomatic action, the substitution of judicial sense of responsibility for diplomatic sense of responsibility. We need for arbitration, not distinguished public men concerned in all the international questions of the day, but judges who will be interested only in the question appearing upon the record before them. Plainly this end is to be attained by the establishment of a court of permanent judges who will have no other occupation and no other interest but the exercise of the judicial faculty under the sanction of that high sense of responsibility which has made the courts of justice in the civilized nations of the world the exponents of all that is best and noblest in modern civilization."

Mr. Root was at this time Secretary of State and in a position to give his ideas effect. He therefore embodied them in his instructions to our delegates to the second Hague Conference. His outline, which was calculated to put arbitration upon a judicial instead of a diplomatic basis, was elaborated by Prof. James Brown Scott, Solicitor for the Department of State, and Technical Delegate to The Hague. Professor Scott, whose name will always be associated with historic attempts to make a High Court of Nations, gave his whole soul to the proposed court at the time and has done his utmost ever since to have it made into a living agency of justice. His plan was brought before the Conference by Mr. Choate, who assisted him enthusiastically. It had the joint sponsorship of the United States, England and Germany. No less strenuous a personage than Baron Marschall von Bieberstein, Germany's first delegate, expressed the belief that such a court would automatically attract to itself the disputes of nations for settlement.

The agreement providing for the court contains thirty-five articles. The first article reads as follows:

“With a view to promoting the cause of arbitration, the contracting powers agree to constitute, without altering the status of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, a Judicial Arbitration Court of free and easy access, composed of judges representing the various juridical systems of the world, and capable of ensuring continuity in jurisprudence of arbitration.”

The main features of the proposed court correspond with Mr. Root's idea of a court of law. They may be best appreciated in a comparison with the so-called Permanent Court of Arbitration. First of all, the proposed institution is a court, and not a panel. The number of its judges, though not given in the agreement, is expected to be fifteen, with deputies as **alternates.** * * *

Next there is the essential characteristic of permanence. The court of 1899 is styled “permanent,” but, as Professor Scott has pointed out, this is a misnomer. The panel is permanent, but the tribunal is only temporary, as it is selected for every new case. In spite of the efforts of the United States to make it permanent, the court of 1899 was never intended by the powers to be so. * * *

The members of the court of 1899 are appointed for a term of but six years, though their appointment is renewable. The judges of the proposed court would have a term of twelve years, which is also renewable. The judges of the court of 1899 are paid only when they are on duty, which is when they have a case to try. The judges of the proposed court would be put on a salary of \$2,400 a year from the time of their appointment, and receive about \$40 a day, with traveling expenses additional, when they go into session. The draft of the agreement contemplates an annual session beginning the third Wednesday in June, provided public business requires it; besides the election annually of three of the members, with substitutes, as a permanent delegation in residence at The

Hague and always ready to try minor cases or cases for summary procedure. The delegation is a unique and promising feature of the proposed court. It makes the court free and easy of access, which is desirable, and is an advantage over the system of the court of 1899, whose tribunals have to be especially summoned, even for a minor case. It is given large power, but cannot perpetuate itself at the expense of the whole court, as it is not only subject to election by the general body, but may at any time, on application of the nations, be superseded by it. The whole court may at any time be summoned in extraordinary session by the delegation. The delegation may act as a Commission of Inquiry, and, as such, may have associated with it nationals of the States parties to a case who, though not members of the court itself, may assist in its investigations. This arrangement therefore supplies machinery for a permanent Commission of Inquiry, such as might take a case like the Dogger Bank incident, with the assistance of naval experts, or any case in which facts are in dispute, and report on its findings. The world has never yet had a permanent commission like this. Provision for it is potentially a great peace measure.

One of the advantages in permanence is continuity of jurisprudence. It is believed that the system of long tenures of office and the provision for a delegation always on duty would tend to the creation of precedents that would ensure continuity of jurisprudence, which is one of the chief purposes of the court. Later its decisions might furnish material for a code of international law, an ideal that in the last generation was held up before the nations by David Dudley Field, and has since been supported by the Interparliamentary Union.

The criticism made by Mr. Root that arbitral procedure has been diplomatic rather than judicial is met by the requirements for the fitness of the arbitrators. Both the court of 1899 and the court proposed in 1907 contemplate the selection of members of high moral character and recognized competency in international law, but the plan for the new court, un-

like that of the institution of 1899, insists that they shall have qualifications as judges according to the standards of their own country or have a reputation as jurists. Here is a safeguard against the choice of mere politicians or diplomatists to adjudicate matters in which compromise, negotiation, and compliance with excited public sentiment are out of place, but in which only the application of the law to the merits of the case is in order, which was Mr. Root's idea as expressed in his New York speech. The court, as already indicated, also contemplates the use of the prevailing systems of jurisprudence—Roman, Spanish and Anglo-American—which its practice is expected to harmonize.

The proposed Judicial Arbitration Court, to be sure, if installed to-day, would not be open to all the nations, as is the present Hague Court, but only to the nations which accept it by entering into a special contract. These nations, however, acting as a whole and not separately, are to pay the salaries of the judges, a method that is an improvement on the court of 1899, as under its system each litigant pays its own judges, a thing that would not be tolerated in a judicial court in municipal law. The costs of the proposed court, apart from the salaries of the officers, are apportioned among the litigants, who are also required to pay their own charges for counsel, witnesses, etc. No judge will be allowed to sit on a case in the decision of which he has already taken part in its earlier stages in national courts, nor can he appear before the court as counsel or advocate in any case, as men have done before the court of 1899. A judge is not permitted to receive money or hold any office under authority of one of the litigants, or of his own nation, inconsistent with his duties as a judge. In these respects, then, the new court is more truly judicial than the court of 1899, and, though limited to the contracting powers, is fundamentally more international in its spirit.

Such are some of the superior features of the proposed Court of Arbitral Justice. It is not, however, intended to

supplant the court of 1899, but to be used instead of it if litigants prefer its services. It is stipulated that its members shall be taken, as far as possible, from the judges of the Permanent Court of Arbitration. In common with that court it follows the procedure laid down in the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, except as it is empowered specifically to make its own rules. Its jurisdiction is as large as possible. It may take cases coming to it by a standing treaty of arbitration or by a special agreement.

* * * As already pointed out, members of it may act as a Commission of Inquiry. They may also serve in the International Prize Court. With such large and varied possibilities the Court of Arbitral Justice ought, when established, to attract nearly all controversies between the nations.

The projected court has the further advantage of being allowed to formulate the preliminary conditions of an intended arbitration, which is known as the *compromis*, unless that be specifically excluded from its power, or is otherwise provided for by treaty. This formulation may be made at the request of one of the parties when diplomacy has failed and the other party is reluctant to arbitrate. The power to make it corresponds somewhat to the forcible citation to court of one party by another in municipal law. This provision does not apply to the twenty-four treaties made between the United States and other powers, as the preliminary agreement under them must, in every case, be made by the President and the Senate. It is, however, especially applicable to disputes relating to contract debts, an agreement to arbitrate which may be made a dead letter by delaying the *compromis*.

The court is supposed to sit at The Hague, but may sit elsewhere if obliged to do so. The delegation may, of its own accord, hold its sessions elsewhere with the consent of the parties, if circumstances make a change of place necessary. The court may call upon states to help it in serving notices and securing evidence. It determines the language that is to be used in cases coming before it. It discusses its cases and

makes decisions upon them in private session under the control of a president or vice-president, but a judge who is appointed by one of the parties may not preside. A judge cannot serve as a member of the delegation "when the power which appointed him, or of which he is a national, is one of the parties" (Art. 6). The decisions of the court must be made in writing by a majority of the judges present, who must give the reasons for their opinions and disclose their names. The judgment must be signed by the president and registrar. The court is authorized to improve upon its rules of procedure, but must communicate them to the contracting powers for approval.

The draft of the new court was approved by the second Hague Conference, except as to the selection of judges, Switzerland alone reserving its vote, but the court itself has not come into operation. This fact may occasion surprise, but is easily understood when once the present condition of the doctrine of the equality of nations is explained. Theoretically, and, for most purposes, practically, the sovereign states have equal rights in international law, but each is tenacious of its rights, the smaller and the newer states being, if anything, more jealous of them than their larger neighbors. As Mr. Choate put it in his humorous way, in an address at the Harvard Union two or three years ago, Panama cannot see why she is not as important as England. But states as big as England take a different view of the matter; they believe that they should have special consideration, and are unwilling to trust their interests to judges appointed by the smaller states on equal terms with themselves.

No plan within the political ingenuity of the Hague Conference could determine satisfactorily how fifteen judges could be equitably apportioned among forty-six states. The rotation scheme adopted for the International Prize Court of fifteen judges, those of the greater powers, with correspondingly large maritime interests, eight in all, Germany, Austria-Hungary, United States, France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan

and Russia, sitting all the time, and those of the smaller powers, according to a classified list, some of the time, in a fixed period of years, though acceptable for the settlement of claims resulting from war, was not acceptable for the adjudication of differences that might cause war. * * *

The suggestion is made now, and bids fair to be accepted, that the difficulty be met by conferring the jurisdiction of the Court of Arbitral Justice upon the Prize Court. Mr. Knox, addressing the Pennsylvania Society of New York, in December, said: "Very recently the State Department has proposed in a circular note to the powers that the Prize Court should also be invested with the jurisdiction and functions of a Court of Arbitral Justice. The United States as the originator of this project is confidently yet anxiously looking forward to its acceptance by the powers, which will give to the world an international judicial body to adjudge cases arising in peace as well as controversies incident to war." This method of constituting the court, as Dr. George W. Kirchwey aptly pointed out in an address in Boston, is a conservative, a lawyer's way of making progress, as it makes use of an already existing institution. The Conference left the matter to be adjusted by negotiation. When, therefore, a method of appointing the judges is agreed upon, the new High Court of Nations will get to work. That it may go into operation soon and become the recognized means of settling the disputes of nations judicially, as is fondly hoped by its distinguished legal advocates, should be the wish of every lawyer and of every friend of international peace.

—Reprint from *The Advocate of Peace*, Jan., 1910.

Paraphrase of Secretary Knox's Circular to the Powers

At the recent Hague Peace Conference, the delegates of Germany, France, Great Britain and the United States introduced a joint project for the establishment of an international prize court, to be composed of fifteen judges, eight of whom were to sit during the life of the convention, namely, six years, and to be chosen from the larger maritime countries—Germany, Austria-Hungary, France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Russia and the United States. The other judges were to be chosen from the remaining states to sit for a longer or shorter period, as determined by the maritime standing of their respective countries.

After much discussion the project was adopted by the conference on October 18, 1907. The proposed court would be international because created by the nations as a whole, it would be permanent because its composition was determined, although not necessarily in session unless business was presented to it; and it would safeguard the rights of neutral commerce because the legality of the capture of neutral property by any nations at war would be finally determined by a court composed in a large majority of judges drawn from States not participating in the war.

The law to be administered, in the absence of special convention, was to be the rules of international law, and in the absence of any recognized rule, in accordance with the general principles of equity and justice. The law was thus indefinite, but the Naval Conference at London (December 4, 1909-February 26, 1909) has supplied the court with a satisfactory and comprehensive code.

The prize court was to be a court of appeal, either from the original national court in which the case was tried, or from the judgment of its appellate court.

The United States has not submitted judgments of its courts to international tribunals, although it has very frequently presented questions involved in its courts to mixed commissions, and has promptly paid the awards when the decision has taxed the United States with liability not found in its national court.

Appeal from a court of the United States to the International Court might raise a delicate and difficult question of constitutional law and render difficult, if not impossible, the ratification of the prize court by the United States.

The difficulty is one of form rather than substance, for whether the principle involved in the judgment be decided or the judgment of a national court be submitted, the result will be the same, namely, a decision upon the locality of the capture.

Therefore, the Department of State has proposed, in a circular note to the Secretary of State, dated October 18, 1909, that States confronted with constitutional objections in the matter of direct appeal from their national courts may present, instead of the judgment of their national courts, the question involved in the capture giving rise to the controversy, and that the proceedings in such a case shall be in the nature of a retrial *de novo*; and that the judgment of the International Prize Court shall in such cases be limited to the award of damages for the illegal capture.

The acceptance of this proposal by the signatories to the convention would not violate its spirit, but would apparently remove the difficulties now standing in the way of the establishment of the court.

The Second Hague Peace Conference not merely adopted the Prize Court, but agreed upon the advisability of a court of arbitral justice, and adopted the thirty-five articles concerning the organization, jurisdiction and procedure of the Court of Arbitral Justice jointly proposed by the delegations of Germany, Great Britain and the United States.

Therefore, acting upon the recommendation of the conference, and as originator of the project, the United States

has proposed in a circular note of the Secretary of State, dated October 18, 1909, and addressed to the signatories of the International Prize Court, that the Prize Court should be invested with the jurisdiction and functions of the Court of Arbitral Justice, and that when so sitting it should act in accordance with the draft convention for the establishment of a Court of Arbitral Justice, approved and recommended by the Second Hague Peace Conference on October 18, 1908.

The advantage of investing the Prize Court with the functions of a Court of Arbitral Justice needs no argument, because it is obviously easier to utilize an existing body than to create a new institution, and as the judges of the Prize Court must necessarily be versed in international law, they could well be entrusted with any question susceptible of arbitration.

The proposition has the very great advantage of providing the nations with a permanent court of arbitration for the peaceful settlement of controversies in times of peace; whereas the prize court as such presupposes a state of war, for without war the capture of property is illegal.

The court would thus be in reality permanent, obviating the delay involved in the creation of a temporary tribunal and developing international law by a series of carefully considered precedents by judges carefully chosen and acting under a sense of judicial responsibility.

Arbitration would not merely be, as both Hague conferences have said, the most efficacious and most equitable methods of settling disputes which diplomacy has failed to adjust, but would be judicial in fact as well as in theory.

Knox for Arbitral Court

WASHINGTON, Jan. 5.—Secretary Knox has addressed a circular note to the powers proposing that the jurisdiction of the International Prize Court, authorized in 1907 by The Hague Peace Conference, be extended so as to make it a court of arbitral justice. This note was dated October 18, 1909. No responses have been received. A statement explaining the contents of the note and the reasons for the proposal was given out to-night by Secretary Knox..

The International Prize Court was to be composed of fifteen judges, eight of whom were to be chosen from the larger maritime countries, Germany, Austria-Hungary, France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and the United States, and were to serve six years. The other judges were to be chosen from the remaining nations.

In his statement Secretary Knox says:

The advantage of investing the Prize Court with the functions of a court of arbitral justice needs no argument, because it is obviously easier to utilize an existing body than to create a new institution, and as the Judges of the Prize Court must necessarily be versed in international law they could well be intrusted with any question susceptible of arbitration. The proposition has the very great advantage of providing the nations with a permanent court of arbitration for the peaceful settlement of controversies in times of peace; whereas, the Prize Court, as such, presupposes a state of war, for without war the capture of property is illegal.

Utilizing the method of composition of the Prize Court by thus investing it with the jurisdiction and functions of a court of arbitral justice would constitute this latter tribunal, and the world would thus have for the States freely consenting to and accepting the proposition one international judiciary to adjudge cases arising in peace as well as controversies springing from war. The court would thus be permanently consti-

tuted and would in reality be permanent, obviating the delay involved in the creation of a temporary tribunal, and developing international law by a series of carefully considered precedents by judges carefully chosen and acting under a sense of judicial responsibility. Arbitration would not merely be, as both Hague Conferences have said, the most efficacious and most equitable method of settling disputes which diplomacy has failed to adjust, but would be judicial in fact as well as in theory.

Another suggestion was made to the powers in regard to the modification of the status of the prize court so as to hasten its formation. Secretary Knox proposed that nations confronted with constitutional objections in the matter of direct appeal from their national courts to the prize court, might present, instead of the judgment of their national courts, the question involved in the capture at issue, and that the proceedings in such a case should be in the nature of a retrial *de novo*, and that the judgment of the international prize court should be limited to the award of damages for the illegal capture.

—From *New York Times*, Jan. 6, 1910.

An Arbitral Tribunal

Regardless of the question of the slaughter of human beings and the misery of the families of the slain, war does not pay, and, therefore, should be abolished. If it ever is abolished, it will be from economic and not humanitarian causes. But whether we consider the miseries or the losses of war, it should be ended by the common consent of nations. There is but one way to end it, and that is by the establishment of a permanent arbitral court with power to effectually decide all international controversies. For years the people and the Government of the United States have favored the establishment of such a court. They favor it now. Secretary Knox, in behalf of our Government and people, has proposed to the powers signatory to The Hague convention that such a permanent court shall be created with real powers analogous to the powers of domestic courts. Great Britain, it is reported, has declined the proposition, whether in principle or upon questions of detail, does not appear.

Great Britain is probably the greatest obstacle to the substitution of the decisions of courts for the decisions of arms, for the reason that she insists on maintaining a navy strong enough to destroy the combined navies of any other two powers. So long as Great Britain holds to that policy, Germany will insist on ruining her people by maintaining the strongest army in the world, and also building a navy as nearly as possible of the strength of the British navy. Germany has a population nearly 50 per cent. greater than that of the United Kingdom and more effective per unit. Therefore, in time Germany will have more money than Great Britain and can build more ships. But in addition to her navy, Germany maintains a most powerful army, and the strain is becoming fearful. Realizing her numerical inferiority, Great Britain is

seeking to bring her self-governing colonies to the defense of the empire, and to the extent that she is succeeding, the people of these colonies are beginning to endure taxation from which they have hitherto been free.

They had better all quit it—even Russia and Japan—and unite with this country and others in creating an arbitral court, disbanding their armies and stopping the inventing and building of new engines of destruction. It is, of course, a matter of sentiment. But it is also a matter of sense.

From *San Francisco Chronicle*, Feb. 24, 1910.

But how much more satisfactory it would be to join with all powers in a simple treaty of arbitration for difficulties involving new territory, boundaries, markets, spheres of influence, commercial privileges, and the like, not already settled by act of purchase or conquest. Such an understanding would be worth more than single treaties. Would it not be a task worthy of America to lead in such an enterprise? And could Japan be in better business than to foster it?

—From *San Francisco Chronicle*, Mar. 19, 1910.

Reply of France to the Knox Proposal

Paris, March 2.—The French government has replied to Secretary Knox's proposal to the Powers looking to the establishment of a permanent international court of arbitral justice, accepting the proposition in principle, but making certain suggestions, which the French government believes will bring all the other Powers into accord.

Before replying to the note, the French government obtained opinions on the subject from M. Bourgeois, Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, and M. Renault, the French members of the permanent Hague Tribunal.

The exact nature of the French suggestions accompanying the reply has not been disclosed.

—From *N. Y. Evening Post*, March 2, 1910.

The Peace Movement

The Federation of the World

By WALTER JOHN BARTNETT

The world is in a transition period. Tribes and petty kingdoms have slowly evolved into nations. Nations are beginning to recognize the brotherhood of man, the supremacy of right and justice and the duty of the strong toward the weak. The day of national conflicts and the barbarity of war is ending. The dawn of peace is approaching. This does not mean that there may be no further wars; it means merely that forces are now evolving that will finally put an end to war.

By "federation of the world" is not meant the formation of one government that will supersede the existing governments. By this we mean that ultimately an agreement will be entered into by all great powers whereby will be formed a confederation represented by a congress of able delegates to which will be granted certain functions pertaining to the mutual benefit of the peoples of the several powers and to all the rest of the world, each nation otherwise maintaining strictly its own autonomy.

The latest step in this direction has been the sending by Secretary of State, Philander C. Knox, of a circular note to the great powers, suggesting to them an agreement to establish a court of arbitral justice. This is a great stride forward. It had been before suggested by the Peace Conference at The Hague in 1907 that there be established a prize court. Now it is proposed that this court be vested with the "jurisdiction and functions of an international court of arbitral justice." This would mean that a tribunal would be established whose functions would be to settle all cases arising, in peace as well as those incident to war, among nations. The State Depart-

ment expects that this note will be favorably received by the great powers. That it will have the assent of some of the nations, there is no doubt.

The peace question is one of the most vital questions of the day. Preparedness for war is affecting as never before the finances of the great nations. The annual expenditures for navy and army purposes have been steadily increasing. National indebtedness has been expanding in an unprecedented manner. Even in times of peace the national expenditures for army and navy purposes have become a tremendous burden on the peoples of all the great nations. At the present hour England is in the throes of a great parliamentary struggle. Her constitution, unwritten though it be, is being put to the test. The very existence of the House of Lords is at issue. This condition of affairs has resulted from the budget, which imposes new and extraordinary forms of taxation. This is occasioned by the necessity of building new Dreadnoughts and providing for the exorbitant and extraordinary naval and military requirements. It has been the policy of England to maintain the standard of her navy at a degree equal to that of any two great powers. To maintain this standard is taxing her to the extreme. William T. Stead says that the expenditures of England for 1910 for naval purposes alone will exceed \$200,000,000, and that if England maintains the two-power standard her expenditures must exceed \$300,000,000, for the reason that Germany purposes to expend on her navy in 1910 \$160,000,000.

Why this mad race for new battleships? It is because England is in dread of a great conflict with Germany, and Germany is preparing for a conflict with England. Germany is stirred to the core. Her shipyards are working day and night building battleships and torpedo-destroyers. The German people are groaning under the weight of the taxation for navy and army purposes. A great party in Germany is protesting against this policy of the Emperor. Some of the other nations of Europe are approaching bankruptcy to keep up this race of naval construction. Russia is building a new

navy, while millions of her people are suffering from want of food. Even Austria proposes to build a powerful fleet.

Why all this? Because of the lack of intelligent direction and the lack of confidence of one government in another. The English government is suspicious of the German Emperor. Fear has been communicated to the minds of the English people. They now distrust the German people, their own kinsmen.

This can all be avoided. How? By the governments arriving at an understanding. This understanding can be easily reached. How can this be done? We believe that it can best be effected by the appointment of Theodore Roosevelt as a delegate to The Hague, and by authorizing him as a Peace Commissioner to confer in an informal way with the rulers of Germany, England, France, Russia, and Japan on the subject of disarmament and the proceedings to be taken to promote the world's peace, also the proceedings to be considered at the next Peace Conference at The Hague. This movement has already taken shape. Andrew Carnegie has taken an active interest in this cause and has openly proclaimed that it is the thing to do and expressed his determination to help. Money will be needed to achieve results, but the money will be forthcoming for this purpose. Mr. Ginn, the Boston publisher, has recently made a donation of \$1,000,000 to help the peace cause along. Money will be provided from other sources, and from the utterances he has made there is little doubt that Mr. Carnegie himself will help. William R. Hearst has lent the aid of his papers to this cause and throughout the United States the potent voice of public opinion has been stirred up by the able editorials written by John Temple Graves and published in all the Hearst papers. This sentiment bids President Taft to act. Mr. Roosevelt should go to Europe as the representative of the American people, as a delegate of a friendly government not concerned in European politics. Mr. Roosevelt, when President, performed a great service for humanity in his timely intervention in the Russo-Japanese war, which won for him the Nobel Prize. He can

perform a greater service now by lending the weight of his personality and by devoting his energy and ability to a movement which will have for its object the cessation of further construction of battleships and torpedo-destroyers, and which will ultimately result in the disarmament of the great powers and the organization of The Hague tribunal into a permanent court or institution that will render it unnecessary for the great nations of the world to exhaust themselves in the struggle to build and maintain great navies and keep millions of men constantly ready for war. President Taft, Congressman Bartholdt, Andrew Carnegie, Senator Cullom, Joseph H. Choate, Elihu Root, Philander C. Knox and George W.ickersham can surely devise some plan whereby Mr. Roosevelt can be commissioned to undertake this great task.

The peace of the world can be settled by Emperor William, King Edward, the Czar of Russia, the President of France, the Emperor of Japan, and the President of the United States. There is no greater work for President Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Carnegie and the others named than this. Theodore Roosevelt, if he will undertake this task, can bring about an understanding that will stop within twelve months the building of Dreadnoughts and the wasting of the substance of millions of men and women in useless and unwise expenditures, and that will ultimately save the lives of hundreds of thousands of men and put an end to much needless suffering and misery.

—Reprint from *New York Tribune*, Feb. 1, 1910.

The Cost of "Armed Peace" to the Nations of the World

The Protest of Representative Tawney

The House of Representatives considered the Army and the Fortification bills during the week just ended, and at every step of the proceedings Chairman Tawney of the Appropriations Committee raised his voice in protest. Time and again he asked the managers of the measures when they thought the ever-swelling war budgets would reach their full size. How long, did they think, would the people of this country and of the rest of the civilized world continue to bend their backs to support the growing soldiers and sailors and their heavy machines of carnage? How long would the doctrine of "armed peace" be tolerated in the councils of enlightened nations? To these questions he got no definite answer, for no man in or out of Congress can tell.

"No nation in the world approaches our expenditures on account of wars past and wars to come," said Representative Tawney in discussing for *The New York Times* the subject of Armed Peace.

"In proportion to the size of our army and navy we are expending about 100 per cent. more than any other power in the world. Navies are built and maintained for national defense. They are not intended and cannot be justified upon the ground that they are necessary to satisfy an ambition, either personal or national, to compete with other nations in time of peace in size and number of fighting machines. In this country the prestige and power of the nation does not depend upon the size of our army or the size of our navy. There is no policy of our Government either foreign or domestic to enforce which the size of either is the first or only

essential. We have 90,000,000 of patriotic people. It is in them and their patriotism that the strength of the nation exists, and not in our standing army or our permanent naval establishment. In the future, as well as in the past, the strength of our policies and the ability of our Government to enforce them will be measured by ourselves and by foreign nations, not by the size of our army or our navy, but by the resources, the patriotism, and the loyalty of our people, who are known throughout the world to be ready and willing at any and all times to sacrifice their property, even their lives, in the defense of their Government and its beneficent institutions.

"The total expenditures of the United States, Great Britain, Germany and France on account of their armies and navies is, in round numbers, ten hundred millions of dollars, or a billion of dollars a year. If you add to this colossal sum the tremendous war budgets of Japan, Russia, Austria, Italy, Spain and the other great powers of the world, all of whom are groaning under the weight of the gladiators they are carrying on their backs, you will have a grand total cost of armed peace so large that the human mind can scarcely comprehend its magnitude.

"Even though we are now appropriating 72 per cent. of our revenue for the wars past and the wars to come there is no hint of a stop in this programme, or even a pause. The war budgets of the world are increasing rapidly and enormously every year, and we are doing our best to keep up with the procession. If we do as well in this line during the next few years as we have since the war with Spain it will be only a question of time when the whole country will be working, not for the pursuit of happiness, not for the education of the rising generation and the support of the family, not for the upbuilding of the arts and sciences, but for the feeding, the arming, and the uniforming of the mightiest military establishment the world has ever known.

"Look at the showing of the figures. Immediately preceding the war with Spain the annual expenditure for the army

was \$24,000,000. That was the yearly army budget for eight years preceding the Spanish war. For the eight years following that war the appropriation leaped to more than \$83,000,000 a year. This year we are asked to appropriate more than \$95,000,000.

"The increase in the sums appropriated for the navy for the same periods is about \$600,000,000, a sum larger than the total expenditures of the Government for any year previous to the Spanish war, and large enough, our friends interested in waterway improvements tell us, to make the great Mississippi River and its tributaries navigable for thousands of miles and to carry out the entire scheme of deepening and broadening of channels that the advocates are now attempting by convention and educational propaganda to enact into law.

"Add the increase in the army appropriations to the increase in the navy appropriations during the eight-year period that I mention and you will have a total of \$1,072,000,000, a sum exceeding by more than \$158,000,000 the total interest-bearing debt of the United States. The sum total of the increase is even greater than the stupendous sum appropriated for all governmental purposes for the year 1910.

"I may be lacking in perception, but I confess that I can see no valid reason for engaging in this latter day 'Dreadnought craze' that has taken possession of the United States along with the other great powers of the world. We seem to be bent now on excelling all other nations in the size and number of big battleships that we are to build each year. If there is any reason to apprehend war with any foreign power within the next decade it has been carefully concealed from the legislative branch of the Government. We saw that we could spare sixteen of our great battleships from our coasts for practically a year. We might just as well spare them for ten.

"Are we to entirely ignore our splendid geographical isolation? Are we to entirely ignore the physical facts that make it practically impossible with the modern means of warfare

for any nation to invade our territory or come within range of our coast line without being intercepted by the means of defense we now have at our command? The transport service of no European nation is sufficient, even without opposition, to land upon American soil an army of 100,000 men at a given time. There is no country in the Orient that has a naval base within reaching distance of our Pacific Coast, and no Oriental nation would be so reckless of its own interests as to risk the loss of its navy or its fleet by attempting to send it past the Hawaiian Islands for the purpose of attacking us upon the Pacific Coast. It would know what is plain to every mind, that without having a naval base between the object of its attack and its home ports, and without its vessels being able to stop somewhere to coal and repair they would never return. In times of war the ports of every country in the world are closed to the navies of the contending nations, and each of the combatants is driven to rely upon its own ports for supplies and for the means of carrying on naval warfare.

“Our splendid fleet of battleships that went round the world could not even start on its record-breaking voyage without the aid of at least twenty-eight auxiliary vessels flying foreign flags, and it was able to complete the great journey only with their assistance. Without the use of these foreign coalers and auxiliary ships of various kinds the trip would not have even been a first class fizzle—it would never have been begun.

“Last year the United States spent nearly \$30,000,000 more in its preparations for war than it has spent on all its public buildings throughout the country since the Government was established, exclusive of the public buildings in Washington itself.

“If you will take the world’s figures of 1908, the last obtainable, you will find that my statement to the effect that proportionately we are spending more money for wars past and to come was made advisedly. We are spending only \$35,000,000 less annually upon our army and navy than Ger-

many with an army twelve times as large as ours and a navy half again as large. Great Britain, with an army four times and a navy three times as big as ours spends only \$66,000,000 more each year; and France, with an army of 500,000 men and a navy of 56,000, does not spend as much annually upon them as we do by more than \$150,000,000 in the course of the year. Taking the sum total of the figures of the cost of preparation for war and of wars past the United States is spending yearly \$84,000,000 more than England, \$136,000,000 more than Germany, and \$152,000,000 more than France.

“In all civilized countries the use of arms in everyday life is discouraged and even prohibited. There is no more reason why the nation should go armed in time of peace than the individual. We do not allow the citizen to go about with revolvers in his pockets because of the danger that society would encounter in such moments of excitement as are likely to occur in ordinary daily experience. Just so there is a danger that nations upon slight provocation or no provocation at all, will declare war upon each other when each knows itself to be dangerously armed and prepared for war. Instead of being a guaranty for peace, therefore, it seems to me that great armaments are a menace to tranquillity. There is no real reason for international war. The age was when it was thought possible for only one great nation to exist in the world at a time. Now we know that great nations are necessary to each other, and as long as geographical and climatic conditions remain as they are all of them can grow great side by side. In this era of national specialization we need the products of other countries to aid us in deriving all the comforts and luxuries of life. To gain all there is out of international life, just as in private life, peace is desirable. International commerce, international trade, international language, international art and literature, international political influence and example all demand that permanent peace be maintained, and none of them can flourish upon international war. But the selfishness handed down from barbaric ages, the distrust that has descended from the misty past, prevents.

"The world must decide in favor of peace without arms some time, however. If it does not it will be crushed by the very weight of the armies and the navies it is building. Some world-wide federation for the insurance of international peace must be substituted for the growing armies and sea powers. Just how this will be brought about I do not pretend to tell. It must come somehow, some time, to save the world from bankruptcy. Perhaps when the nations of the world awake to a realization of the fact that in the fattening armies and navies is found the cause of the lean larders—the increased cost of living—of the people they will take steps to turn their battleships into merchantmen and their cannon into steel rails."

—From *New York Times*, January 16, 1910.

It Is Time to Protest

Secretary Meyer's \$18,000,000 battleship scheme is causing the American people to think. It is the *extensio ad infinitum* which may bring this nation to a realization of the folly of its militaristic policy. If we are to join in this game around the international table, is there to be no limit? Are the great nations of the earth to continue dumping millions on the table in the form of battleships and other military expenditures, each in turn raising the bet of his next neighbor, and taxing the people almost to the breaking point to provide the funds for this game of bluff? The American people are crying out against the burdens of the increased cost of living. It is practically impossible for the head of the average American family to make both ends meet, and provide a decent living for his dependents. Women and children are forced to become bread-winners. This generation and that to come are being deprived of their right to enjoyment of life in order to secure a bare sustenance. No small part of this increased cost of living is due to the increase in the cost of government. Town and city government, state administration, national government are increasing charges on the people. Iniquitous tariff schedules are defended because more receipts must be secured. An unjust and insidious corporation tax is assessed because of "necessity." The federal government seeks an amendment to the Constitution to secure the extraordinary powers of income taxation for federal purposes, a resource never before essayed except in the emergency of war. The national administration recognizes the exigency of the times and talks of a commission to conceive economies in the cost of government. Conservation of natural resources is restricted, needed improvements are denied, the better things of national life are scrimped and short rationed because of lack of funds.

And, facing this situation, an appeal is made to national pride to sustain the extension of our naval policy on an infinite scale. It might be termed the *reductio ad absurdum*, were it not that it is put forward with a plea for national defense, backed up by semi-official hints that rival nations are planning ships and laying keels along a similar policy, a plea that never has failed to appeal to the patriotic American people. But there are signs now that this appeal has been overworked. People are beginning to think. Each of these proposed 32,000-ton Dreadnoughts will cost \$18,000,000. There is not a navy yard or a dock that will accommodate them. Millions must be spent in providing accommodations for them on either coast. Two Dreadnoughts will not make a navy, nor even a fleet. If there are to be two, there must be more. Two years ago as the result of the Japanese war scare Congress authorized two monster battleships, exceeding any ship then in the navy. The immediate consequence was that the necessity of a homogeneous squadron was discovered and two more similar ships were authorized. The same principle applies and the two 32,000-ton ships will need two if not four more to complete the squadron. By that time the game may have passed beyond the \$18,000,000 stakes and in our turn we shall again be obliged to raise the bet, or retire from the play. In the Spanish war times we could build a battleship for \$5,000,000. Already the first of the British Dreadnoughts has been relegated to the plaything class, as compared with the present-day monsters. With the 32,000-ton ship afloat, the 22,000-ton fighters of the world will be outclassed. At least sixteen ships of this type in the navies of the world will be fit chiefly for the junk heap. And there will have been set a pace for the naval game which will mean ruin for governments and peoples. It is time that the United States aroused itself to this unspeakable folly.

Congressman Tawney, of the House Committee on Appropriations, gives warning that over 70 per cent. of the total revenue of the government is now being spent on account of past wars or in preparation for wars to come. In the last eight



years the appropriations for the navy were in the aggregate \$600,000,000 in excess of the aggregate for the previous eight years. A similar comparison of army expenditures showed an increase of \$472,000,000. Yet we are at peace with the world, professing a policy of international peace, pretending a desire to avoid foreign entanglements, seeking no conquests, proud of our diplomatic achievements in the mission of good will to all men. Why this inconsistency?

The clergymen of Massachusetts to-day are forwarding to Washington a protest against these unnecessary military and naval expenditures. That protest should be followed by a similar expression of public opinion, through the press, in collective petitions and in individual remonstrances to members of Congress and Senators. This is not merely an academic peace movement, important and deserving as that may be. It is a protest of the people, crowded to the wall by the bare necessities of life, demanding that they be not required to bear extra burdens merely to maintain a national boast of naval supremacy.

—From *Boston Herald*, March 2, 1910.

Halting Naval Extravagance

Chairman Tawney, of the House Committee on Appropriations, in promising to fight against the new \$18,000,000 battleships pledges himself to a worthy cause.

Including interest on public debt, pensions and other charges properly due to wars past or to war preparations, Mr. Tawney finds that 71 per cent. of the expenditures of the Government outside of the Post-Office Department is military. In a similar computation made only three years ago he placed the war expenditures of the Government at 65 per cent. of the total. The proportion of public money spent on war constantly rises.

Mr. Allison, Chairman of the corresponding committee in the Senate, showed at about the same time that since 1883 the yearly cost of pensions had risen by \$30,000,000; of the army by \$51,000,000; of the navy by \$84,000,000. To offset the higher cost of pensions there was an almost equivalent reduction of \$25,000,000 in interest charges on war debt. The great increase came wholly in war preparations, which are in their nature war provocatives.

The naval appropriation for 1910 is more than double the naval expenditure in the year of the Spanish war. It is ten times as great as in 1886, five times as great as in 1896. If we begin turning 16,000-ton battleships into junk by building ships of 32,000 tons to cost \$18,000,000 each, even the present vast expenditure will soon be doubled.

From *N. Y. World*, Mar. 1, 1910.

One Tenth of One Per Cent for Peace

Congressman Tawney, Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, has shown that the annual cost of armed peace to the United States, which is a tranquil Nation, is \$400,000,000. Past wars cost \$160,000,000 a year in pensions, soldiers' homes, and soldiers' burials, while anticipated wars cost the huge balance of this total \$400,000,000. Yet the forty-six American States exist without preparation for war against each other—knit together by the common interests of intercourse.

In like manner commerce and intercourse are knitting together the nations. No government of them all, groaning under an excessive war budget, but considers seriously the project of disarmament. It has been proposed to the nations that they appropriate yearly toward casting off this terrible and useless burden one-tenth of 1 per cent. of what it costs them.

Denmark has accepted the proposal. Great Britain, too, has resolved to pay from \$100,000 to \$250,000 toward it annually, in the discretion of its Chancellor of the Exchequer. France and Germany are considering, and with every prospect of adoption, this plan to appropriate a tithe of a hundredth of their war outlays in the interest of international commerce and peace. And during the present session of Congress the United States will be asked to contribute a like percentage. The total yearly sum thus raised by the principal Powers should amount to \$390,000.

The nations support The Hague Court at the paltry annual cost of \$2,500. What might they not accomplish with \$390,000, devoted each year to the cause of peace?

—From *N. Y. Times*, Feb. 23, 1910.

America Now Has Opportunity to Lead the World to Peace or War

By JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

Washington, March 7.—There are thoughtful men at the Capital as in the metropolis who believe that the issues of the next decade hold for the world either *universal peace or universal war*.

Forces of tremendous moment are moving powerfully toward either possibility side by side. The white banner of peace and the red flag of carnage are struggling to the front of human interest as the arbiter of issues and of life to the nations.

It is one or the other that must win.

The dispatches from New York quote Jacob Schiff, capitalist, conservative, peace enthusiast and financial friend of Japan, as saying on Saturday to the Republican Club that war with Japan was inevitable.

Along the same wire comes the statement of Professor Blumentritt, the scientific expert and the intimate of the intellectual Filipino insurgents, seeking to align the Philippines and Japan in a war against the United States. Russia and Japan are joining hands to keep China as an inferior state, and England, never our sincere friend, is perhaps a party to the compact—all of them ready and willing to unite in eliminating America as a dangerous rival from the Pacific, and making to our country the "open door" a mockery.

It is no longer possible to call the man who foresees the practical possibilities of war a "Jingo."

The situation in the East is full of menacing possibility. The New York American has thundered this warning since the peace party of Portsmouth made Japan the menace of the Pacific.

The State Department in Washington makes a superb endeavor to be optimistic, and expresses the hope that England has been misinformed and may yet be persuaded that her national and political loyalty is toward its American kin.

Neither supposition has a logical basis of possibility. England is never misinformed. Its diplomacy is as accurate as it is selfish, and it knows its ground. Neither can England be persuaded. England never allows its principles to interfere with its interests. And whenever England's interests lie opposite to America, it will sacrifice America as remorselessly in the future as it has in the past.

Perhaps a vigorous and astute diplomacy may extricate our country from the perilous conditions made by this new Dreibund of Trade in the Orient.

But the safe course—the only wise and commonsense course—is for our country to prepare resolutely and vigorously to be ready to meet any condition that may arise.

The navy and the merchant marine heretofore a bone of contention, becomes now a vital question of self protection and self preservation. There is no patriotic American who can forgive or forget the American statesman who in this hour of crisis stands obstructive in the path of "preparedness" which now becomes the path of safety and of patriotism.

There is no half way ground for the American citizen of today.

It is our policy made clear by our condition and our opportunity, either to lead the world in an equipment and preparation for war, or to lead the mighty movement of the nations toward universal peace. *With us it is a clear question of battle-ships or a world congress of peace.*

We are equipped for primacy and usefulness in either field, and the chances of success are balanced either way we move.

The boundless riches and the unparelled resources of our great Republic offer us an opportunity for naval and mercantile development which is only limited and circumvented by the courage and intelligence of our statesmanship.

The disinterested attitude of a mighty nation and its splendid isolation offer us equally an easy avenue to leadership in the great international movement, whose spirit was breathed into the New York American's Christmas editorials in behalf of universal peace.

This is a psychological moment in the world's history. The nations are actually balanced everywhere between peace and war. The taxpayer is without exception for peace. The martial spirit of aggressive commerce is for war to attain

its ends. The balance will fall to peace or war as the publicist may awaken the people to the end that.

"The common sense of most shall hold the fretful realms in awe."

The pity of it and the danger are that it is always possible to arouse the world by rumors or threats of war. There is in all the universe no theme so noble and inspiring as universal peace. And yet its evangel scarcely quickens the pulse of the public or awakens a response from those who hold the theme in tender reverence.

It is well to know in this time of ominous international menace that the machinery for universal peace is already majestic in scope and power.

The United States of the world is a living fact not complete in its final, best working form, but it has well in hand the processes for development and for the fulfilment of its mission, which is peace and good will for all earth.

This union of nations is built out of all human experience in government. It has its judiciary department in the permanent international court now located at The Hague. It has its legislative department in the inter-parliamentary unions developed into the united national parliaments of the world, and it has its temporary acting executive, whose title is the peacemaker, as the result of a ballot taken by mail in 1904 from an electoral college composed of the twenty-eight thousand intellectual leaders of the English-speaking world.

It has its banner, and this is known and accepted by all the world. It is the flag of every nation within that nation in the broad field of white, and outside of every nation, the rainbow in a white field. It has its supporting fund in a proposed tax, which has been accepted by many of the nations, equal to one-tenth of one per cent of the amount annually expended in equipment and preparation for war.

The idea of this fund and its use was unanimously approved by the Interparliamentary Union at their meeting in the Parliament House of London in 1906, and this upon the motion of Richard Bartholdt, chairman of the Peace group, and representing the Congress of the United States.

—From *New York American*, Mar. 8, 1910.

The Madness of Aerial Warfare

By THOMAS J. VIVIAN

If an argument, either of the balance sheet or humanitarian sort, were needed to strengthen the great Christmas appeal of Mr. William Randolph Hearst to the nations of the world for universal peace, it is furnished by the latest example of the spirit of havoc on the part of three of those nations.

These nations are England, Germany and France, and their offense lies in their deliberate plan to be the slaughtering Lords of the Air.

It is no new thing, of course, that the offensive and defensive possibilities of aviation have been seriously considered by these and other Powers—ourselves included—but the graver aspects of the subject, the deliberate cold-bloodedness with which the sky navies are being assembled, the determined acceptance of the “inevitability” of aerial warfare, the amazing fashion of conceding the possibility that this new armament will supersede the existing forces—all these are phases of the question whose full significance may not be appreciated.

The same frenetic, febrile rivalry that has resulted in the Anglo-German epidemic of Dreadnoughtitis is seen in the construction by both countries of dirigible war balloons. * * *

Perhaps, after all, the most impressive feature of the whole strange, unhappy, depressing situation is the businesslike method with which the necessity of framing regulations for the coming Armageddon of the Air is discussed.

Colonel Stone, of the English army, lecturing a few days ago before the Aeronautical Society, took up the matter of the bombardment of English towns by airships.

He laid it down as an ordinary proposition that Portsmouth and Aldershot could be legitimately blown to pieces by aerial warships, the one being a dockyard and the other a camp, but not London, because it is an undefended town. And with a

shocking calmness he proposed, "as a distinct gain to civilization," that at the next Hague conference there should be introduced the following article: "That no bombardment from aero-vessels shall be permitted against any place except for the purpose of destroying its defenses, defenders or war material."

About the same time, at a meeting of the Imperial Aero Club of Germany, crowded with savants and military chiefs, Professor A. Meyer, of Frankfort, offered laws for the neutrality or belligerency of aerial limits, and declared that there ought to be no special code of honor for hostile aeronauts, and that scouts captured in the air should be shot as spies.

A great Field Marshal of England, Lord Roberts, in a public speech declared that "people are brave and confident because they know nothing of what is going on (in the way of other nations preparing aerial fleets). If they only knew," he said, "what is in store for them unless they wake up, they might be valorous, but they would not be so confident."

And Major-General Baden-Powell, in another lecture, described, not as a novelist, but as a war expert, the coming combat in which soldiers will ride a slim pair of wings, in which monoplane and biplane will grapple above the tree tops, in which there will be terrible balloon duels, death by flying darts and the horrors of explosive kites.

And what shall be said of governments that in the preparation of these tremendous instruments of destruction calmly contemplate the contingency that with every advance they make in the destructive force of their new engines of war they correspondingly make their fleets and armies useless; and that, when they have succeeded in putting aloft squadrons of death-dealing machines against which the mightiest Dreadnoughts of the sea will be powerless, it will mean that they themselves will have rendered useless an armament on which they have squandered such millions upon millions as would in the aggregate give comfort to all the poor of the world.

—From *New York American*, Jan. 11, 1910.

Comparisons: Education and War Preparation

The unwisdom of being ill-prepared for war is plain. Battleships are, as it were, the price of a bloodless war; for if we have enough of these we shall not pay the heavier tax which actual war extorts. The preparation is that tribute to Cæsar which the great preacher of peace approved, paid to buy the quiet for going on in the paths of those higher things with which Cæsar had no concern. War rises from those same selfishnesses in human nature which allow the waste of the national resources of every sort. Not by cutting off war shall the human family learn to be brothers. When brotherhood is learned war will cease. Meantime it is well to consider such an array of figures as was lately presented by Robert C. Root, peace commissioner, before the teachers' institute at Los Angeles. Since experience has proved that it is the man back of the gun that counts, then the educational systems of a country are no mean part of the national defenses. The discrepancy between the expenditures for the higher and the lower means of defense is certainly very great. Mr. Root said:

“To those who have eyes to see there is again a handwriting on the wall which being interpreted reads, ‘Mars, god of war, is doomed.’ There are many signs pointing to the world’s awakening. Men are losing faith in the old policies, they are learning that preparation for war does not bring peace.” He gave numerous statistics to show the waste in preparation for war. The battleship Oregon was built at a cost of over \$6,000,000. It is now out of commission as useless, having been in active service but 11 years. In contrast with this waste he stated that Harvard University, which had been in active service for 273 years, cost for construction to the present time between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000—less than the ship with a life of but 11 years.

At the recent Seattle Fair was exhibited a 13-inch gun the cost of construction of which was as much as many of our high schools. The cost of one shot from this gun is \$1,000—equal to the annual salary of many of our high school teachers. He closed with the quotation from Burns:

“It’s comin’ yet for a’ that,
That man to man, the world o’er,
Shall brothers be for a’ that.”

—From *Christian Science Sentinel*.

Words of President Taft

At the recent Diamond Peace Jubilee of Methodist Episcopal Missions for Africa, President Taft uttered these impressive and significant words:

“We are a great power in the world, and we may be, and I hope we are, a great power for usefulness, a great power for the spread of Christian civilization, and we must be so if we would justify our success and vindicate our right to enjoy the opportunities that God has given us in this fair, broad land of building of wealth and comfort and luxury and education and making ourselves what we like to think we are—the foremost people of the world.

“There are those who would read the last words of Washington in his farewell message as an indication that we ought to keep within the seas and not look beyond, but he was addressing thirteen States that had much to do before they could make themselves a great nation, and that might well avoid entangling alliances, or any foreign interference or any foreign trouble, while they were making themselves a nation. But now we are a nation with tremendous power and tremendous wealth, and unless we use that for the benefit of our international neighbors (and they are all neighbors of ours, for the world is very small), unless we use that power and that wealth we are failing to discharge the duties that we ought to feel as members of the international community.”

The first President of the United States spoke more than a century ago, according to the wisdom of his age. The President of to-day speaks in the broader light of an infinitely larger and more responsible time, interpreting rather than antagonizing the views of his immortal predecessor.

The words of President Taft make the real inaugural of the

great peace movement which America is leading for the world.

It lifts the nation above the limitations of the past and launches the United States upon a mighty mission of peace and good will to men. Neither the State Department nor the Executive feel anything but confidence as to the ultimate outcome of the overtures which have been sent from Washington to the nations. The spirit of the age is behind them; the spirit of all nations is beneath them, and the movement, once started from so illustrious a source, cannot be stayed. The President has sounded forth the peace bugles which must never know restraint.

If the patriotism of the past has been builded upon the sentiment "Our country as against every other country," the larger patriotism of the future must say, "Our country as with every other country," with unabated devotion to our own great land; but, with a full recognition of the rights and happiness of our fellow man, we must, with loftier loyalty and more heroic effort, contribute such qualities of brain and soul to our country that it may lead the world in the nobility of its people, in its sense of universal justice and in its more majestic conceptions of government.

Past patriotism has expressed itself in a wild race for power and in increasing armaments until 70 per cent. of the amount intrusted through taxation by the people to government has been spent in equipment for slaughter. It is our mission now to educate the world to that conception of world-patriotism which will save the colossal treasure to peace and to the beneficent children of peace.

This is the spirit in which the White House and the departments have assumed the initiative in the world's peace movement.

This is the spirit in which the Press and the People should meet and sustain it.

And with the Government, the Press and the People united

in this pacific and shining crusade, the time is inevitably and swiftly coming

“When the war drum throbs no longer
And all battle flags are furled,
In the Parliament of Man,
‘The federation of the world.’

JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES in the *American*.

President Taft on National Honor

From speech at banquet given by American Peace and Arbitration League,
New York, March 22nd, 1910

“I have noticed exceptions in our arbitration treaties, as to reference of questions of national honor to courts of arbitration. Personally I do not see any more reason why matters of national honor should not be referred to a court of arbitration than matters of property or of national proprietorship.

“I know that is going further than most men are willing to go, but as among men we have to submit differences even if they involve honor, now, if we obey the law, to the court, or let them go undecided. It is true that our courts can enforce the law, and as between nations there is no court with a sheriff or a marshal that can enforce the law. But I do not see why questions of honor may not be submitted to a tribunal supposed to be composed of men of honor who understand questions of national honor, to abide their decision, as well as any other question of difference arising between nations.”

Words of Cardinal Gibbons

BALTIMORE, Jan. 15.—Cardinal Gibbons dictated the following statement for the *New York American* to-day concerning Secretary Knox's proposal for an International Peace Court:

"Our distinguished Secretary of State deserves great credit for the efforts he is making in the cause of a pacific solution of international difficulties.

"If the project succeeds he will deserve the thanks of the civilized world and will reflect great honor on the administration of President Taft, as well as upon himself."

Words of Hon. John W. Foster

Popular feeling in the country will have to be greatly changed before there can be any substantial and permanent realization of the principles of the peace societies, in the opinion of John W. Foster, ex-Secretary of State, who sent a communication to the Peace Society of New York. According to Mr. Foster, all the foreign wars in which the United States has been engaged were brought on by our own precipitate action and could have been avoided by the exercise of prudence and deliberation.

Words of Senator Burton

"We have the confidence of the entire world," said Senator Theodore E. Burton, of Ohio, before the Peace Society of New York, on January 15, 1910, "and it is our duty to take part in every arbitration and every movement having for its purpose the staying of the ravages of war."

The argument, he said, that nations have to maintain large standing armies in order to keep peace was mere fallacy. It

was almost as foolish, he said, as the argument that armies were required for the dissemination of Christianity.

Senator Burton said the appropriation for maintaining the army and navy and other adjuncts of war in the United States was \$135,000,000 in 1908, and a million greater last year. This was ten times as much as in 1880, greater than the total expenses of the Federal Government in 1878, and twice as much as that of 1861.

"Two-thirds of all the expenditures of the Federal Government go for this purpose," said the Senator, "and yet you ask are we a peaceful or a warlike nation. I have heard recently complaints regarding the high cost of living and many fantastic reasons for it. I don't say that it is the principal reason, but certainly one of the main causes is the increased burden of Federal and local taxation. In a few months the question of building new battleships will come up. The present program should be cut in two. I believe in a navy that man for man and gun for gun is the best in the world, but I don't believe in building warships so fast that we cannot get men to man them. Our triumphs of the past have been triumphs of peace rather than of war."

Words of Dr. Benjamin Ide Wheeler

(Dr. Benjamin Ide Wheeler, president of the University of California, is an intimate friend of both Emperor William and former President Roosevelt.)

The economic wastefulness and general folly of war are forcing themselves everywhere to recognition. As the world is filling up we have all got to turn and conserve, not destroy. War is, furthermore, no tribunal to which reason or humanity can wish to be referred. Peace by arbitration cannot, however, be secured without strength to enforce. The monstrous equipments of recent years move quite as much toward peace

as toward war. For the past thirty years there has been, for example, no national force making for peace more certainly than Germany. Her growing industrial interests assure a continuance for the future.

The recent competitive equipments of the nations represent, however, in themselves, intolerable economic waste. The initial cost of a Dreadnought would endow a university in perpetuity. They also involve an evident absurdity. It is like three or more representatives of the same man bidding against each other at an auction. They all want, or ought to want, one and the same thing—peace; but they are trying to get it each for himself, and one at a time.

What is needed is a syndicated power that will guarantee the order of the world and enforce the findings of an international court. Our most definite present hope of finding it, however, would seem to be located at the bottom of our respective national purses.

—From *New York American*, Feb. 18, 1910.

Words of Dr. MacArthur

Dr. Robert Stuart MacArthur, in his pulpit at Calvary Baptist Church (New York City), yesterday suggested that the United States should make Theodore Roosevelt a delegate-at-large to all the nations in the world for the bringing about of universal peace. In Dr. MacArthur's opinion there was no position in which Colonel Roosevelt could accomplish more or better crown his life's work than in being the principal factor in ushering in the day:

“When the war drums beat no longer,
And the battle flags are furled.”

The remarks of Dr. MacArthur came at the close of an address by Professor Samuel L. Dutton on “Peace and War,” before the Current Events Class, which preceded the Sunday morning sermon.

—From *N. Y. American*, Feb. 21, 1910.

Words of Hon. Richard Bartholdt

Hon. Richard Bartholdt, member of Congress from Missouri, and head of the American Delegation to the several meetings of the Interparliamentary Union, delivered an address at the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, at its meeting last May, in which he said:

“If the President of the United States were to say to King Edward and Emperor William, ‘Let us keep the peace, and in case of any trouble between any two of our three countries, let us not draw the sword until we have had an investigation by an impartial third party, be it power, commission or court,’ if, I say, President Taft were to make a formal proposal of this nature and these two great monarchs were to grasp the outstretched hand, what would be the result? It would signify the end of war.”

Words of Hon. Chas. W. Fairbanks

The Hague tribunal is evidence of the fact that some headway has been made toward the peaceful adjustment of international problems, but it is confessedly inadequate. It is a step in the right direction, but we may well ask, “When will the next be taken?”

The United States and Great Britain have set a good example in settling disputes between them, and their past achievements in arbitration must sooner or later have a profound influence upon other nations. All honor, too, to the United States, Great Britain, France and Germany for their efforts to supplement the work of the Hague conference by giving the principle of peaceful adjustment of international disputes there enunciated a larger practical effect.

Words of King Edward

London, March 1.—King Edward to-day made a plea for universal peace when he received the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and members of the church convocations this afternoon.

“The concord of Christendom is unbroken,” he said, “and rarely in history has the idea of war seemed more repulsive or the desire for peace been more widely cherished throughout my empire.”

The King's words were considered of especial importance in view of the recent German war scare.

From *N. Y. Journal*, Mar. 1, 1910.



Practical Steps to Secure International Peace

By WALTER JOHN BARTNETT

International arbitration must commend itself to all thinking people. Several wars have been prevented by it. But international arbitration as advocated by some of the nations does not go far enough; questions of national honor are excluded from consideration. President Taft may be said to have advanced the cause of international peace by a declaration made in his address before The American Peace and Arbitration League in New York on March 22nd, 1910. In that address he said:

"I have noticed exceptions in our arbitration treaties, as to reference of questions of honor, of National honor, to courts of arbitration. Personally I do not see any more reason why matters of National honor should not be referred to a court of arbitration than matters of property or National proprietorship.

"I know that is going further than most men are willing to go; but as among men we have to submit differences even if they involve honor, now, if we obey the law, to the court, or let them go undecided. It is true that our courts can enforce the law, and as between nations there is no court with a Sheriff or a Marshal that can enforce the law. But I do not see why questions of honor may not be submitted to a tribunal supposed to be composed of men of honor, who understand questions of National honor, to abide their decision, as well as any other question of difference arising between nations."

The conclusion to be drawn from this address is that President Taft is of the opinion that all controversies between nations should be determined by a Supreme Court of International Justice.

The history of the Hague Conference makes it clear that the nations cannot or ~~at~~ least will not disarm until provision is made for the determination by a Supreme Court of International Justice of *all* controversies that may arise between them.

As it is costing the nations two thousand million dollars per annum to maintain their armies and navies, it is clear that the economic thing to do is to establish a tribunal such as the Hague Court with authority to settle all differences between governments, and with power to enforce its decrees. It is estimated that the maintenance of such a court with an army and navy sufficiently powerful to enforce its decrees would cost the nations approximately two hundred million dollars per annum. When such a court is established the governments can safely disarm. It should be the mission of the United States to lead the great Powers in the establishment of such a court. The first step would be to get the Powers to agree as to how the judges of such a court are to be chosen, and to agree to submit to such court all international controversies that may arise.

A Joint Resolution will be introduced in Congress within a few days, authorizing the President to appoint a special commission of five members. The purpose of this commission will be to urge on the nations the proposition above outlined.

The United States expends annually six hundred and fifty million dollars to maintain the national government. One hundred and sixty million dollars per annum of this amount is expended in the payment of pensions, the result of past wars. Three hundred million dollars are annually expended for army and navy purposes. To maintain the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of the government requires an expenditure of only thirty million dollars per annum. Under the present policies the army and navy expenditures are increasing in a surprising manner. In the past eight years they have increased by one billion, sixty-two million dollars over corresponding expenditures during the previous

eight years. If President Taft and Congress act and a peace commission is appointed and if this commission can induce the nations to constitute such a court (or, in other words, confer additional power on the Hague Tribunal) the ultimate result will be the saving to this government of at least two hundred and fifty million dollars per annum for military purposes. The monies now expended for superfluous army and navy purposes could then (if such a course seemed wise) be expended in river and harbor improvements, in irrigation and reclamation projects, in ship-subsidies and in other ways that would be for the upbuilding and prosperity of the people; or, if preferred, taxation could be reduced to the extent of these vast sums. However, the question as to the use of these funds so saved is but a secondary one and nowise concerns the question of international peace.

—Reprint from *N. Y. Evening Post*.

Statue of Universal Peace

It has been suggested that the Peace Movement would be furthered by the erection of a great statue of Universal Peace, in Paris, as the gift of the United States to the Republic of France. It is proposed that Congress appropriate a sum of money, say \$2,500,000, or about one-quarter the cost of a modern battleship, for this purpose. Paris has been called "the capital of Europe." The location of the statue in that city would do much for the cause of peace. Such a statue could well be dedicated to all the nations. The expenditure of \$2,500,000 or even \$5,000,000 for this purpose would undoubtedly receive the approval of the American people.

If Congress acts upon this suggestion and an appropriation is made the sculptors of the world will be asked to formulate a fitting symbol for this great thought. Many concepts of it will be worked out. Here is one: Universal Peace may be represented as a great universal Mother, with a broken sword, a crown of olive branches and a wonderful illuminating light in her hand, leading the way. She should above all embody in every limb and in her attitude a great serenity as being a part of the Universe, which moves silently forward and upward. A transcendent glory should be expressed in her face, as well as power to command the elements. She should be represented as the Universal Mother of Nature and of Humanity.

France gave the American people the Statue of Liberty. The United States symbolizes Liberty. Let us give to Europe the thought, embodied in bronze or marble, of Universal Peace,—a statue so firmly founded and well constructed as to stand throughout the centuries in Paris, the goal of travelers, and serve as a constant reminder and inspiration to the throngs of people of all nations who go thither. The Tomb of Napoleon symbolizes military grandeur, the glory of a departing

age. The Statue of Universal Peace will symbolize the Brotherhood of Man, the triumph of the spiritual over the material,—the coming age.

France and the United States, two Republics! May they clasp hands, and may the goodwill created through this gift spread to other lands, cementing all nations more closely together in respect, mutual understanding and friendship.

—A suggestion by Hendrick Christian Andersen, Rome, Italy.

Position of the Christian Worker for Peace

No! whatever theoretical Christianity may be, actual Christianity must be left out of account. Yet assuredly, the Christian Church, "*de toutes confessions*," ought to be a Peace society—opposed to ALL WAR as incompatible with its testimony, its character, and its very existence.

It is interesting to note in this connection what one of the greatest warriors in history thought in regard to these themes. Napoleon I. was certainly a man whom vast experience had taught what kind of forces can really produce a lasting effect upon mankind, and under what conditions they may be expected to do so. More than any of the world's warriors—owing to the devotion he inspired, which is not yet wholly extinct—he had experience of the value of organised military forces, and of what the spirit of modern militarism, then in its infancy, could accomplish. On the rock of St. Helena the conqueror of civilised Europe had leisure to gather up the results of his unparalleled life, and to ascertain with an accuracy not often attainable by monarchs or conquerors, both the value of military supremacy and his own true place in history.

When conversing, as was his habit, about the great men of the ancient world, and comparing himself with them, he turned, it is said, to Count Montholon with the enquiry, "Can you tell me who Jesus Christ was?" The question was declined, and Napoleon proceeded, "Well, then, I will tell you. Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne, and I myself have founded great empires, but upon what did these creations of our genius depend? Upon force. Jesus alone founded His empire upon love, and to this very day millions would die for Him. . . . I think I understand something of human nature, and I tell you, all these were men, and I am a man; none else is like Him;

Jesus Christ was more than man. I have inspired multitudes with such an enthusiastic devotion that they would die for me but to do this it was necessary that I should be *visibly* present with the electric influence of my looks, of my words, of my voice. When I saw men and spoke to them, I lighted up the flame of self-devotion in their hearts. Christ alone has succeeded in so raising the mind of man towards the Unseen, that it becomes insensible to the barriers of time and space. Across a chasm of eighteen hundred years, Jesus Christ makes a demand which is beyond all others difficult to satisfy. He asks for that which a philosopher may often seek in vain at the hands of his friends, or a father of his children, or a bride of her spouse, or a man of his brother. He asks for the human heart; He will have it entirely to Himself; He demands it unconditionally; and forthwith His demand is granted. Wonderful! In defiance of time and space, the soul of man, with all its powers and faculties, becomes an annexation to the Empire of Christ. All who sincerely believe in Him experience that remarkable supernatural love towards Him. This phenomenon is unaccountable; it is altogether beyond the scope of man's creative powers. Time, the great destroyer, is powerless to extinguish this sacred flame; time can neither exhaust its strength, nor put a limit to its range. This it is which strikes me most; I have often thought of it. This it is which proves to me quite convincingly the divinity of Jesus Christ."

"Here, surely," adds Canon H. P. Liddon, "is the common-sense of humanity." And this, I add, explains the position of the Christian worker for Peace, and his faith in its ultimate and universal triumph, when as the Hebrew poets foretold, nations shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning-hooks, and shall not learn war any more.

—From "International Tribunals," by W. Evans Darby.

The Voice of Religion

"Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also must I bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd."

"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

"Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the Earth. Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

"Ye have heard that it was said of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill, shall be in danger of the judgment. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you."

"All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."
—Jesus.

"From the cotton of compassion spin out the thread of love; make the knots of abstinence and truth; let your mind put on this thread."

—Nanak, a Teacher of the warrior Sikhs.

"The ways unto God are as the number of the breaths of the sons of men."
—A Dervish saying.

"However men approach Me, even so do I accept them, for the path men take from every side is Mine, O Partha."

—The Bhagavad-Gita.

"Let him not be angry again with the angry man; being harshly addressed, let him speak softly."
—Manu.

"Hatred ceases not by hatred at any time; hatred ceases by love. To the man that causelessly injures me, I will return the protection of my ungrudging love; the more evil comes from him, the more good shall flow from me."
—Buddha.

"Harmlessness is the highest duty."
—The Mahabharata.

"One God is hidden in all beings, all-pervading, the inmost Self of all."
—The Upanishads.

"To those who are good, I am good; and to those who are not good, I am also good; and thus all get to be good."
—Lao-Tze.

"Do not unto others that which thou wouldst not they should do unto you."
—Confucius.

"Men, therefore, should foster, not hatred, but love towards each other, which is the only means of enabling an Israelite (a spiritually-inclined person) to link himself to God. Man should not return evil for evil done him by others."

"Man should always look upon himself as if the whole world is dependent upon him, and should ever be ready to sacrifice his body, soul and spirit for the good of humanity."

"The rich and the poor should be united in helping and doing good toward each other."

"It is only by helping and upholding others that man can obtain life eternal and be united to the 'Tree of Life.' "

"Only the person who cultivates unselfish love for all mankind can attain to the 'Palace of Love'" (the Buddhist Nirvana—the highest spiritual state attainable by our humanity). —The Zohar.

"No man shall sit down to his own meals before seeing that all the animals dependent upon his care are provided for."

"The beginning of the divine Law is loving-kindness and its end is loving-kindness."

"Let thy house be open wide as a refuge, and let the poor (of all creeds) be cordially received within thy walls."

"To love a fellow-creature as one's self is the sum-total of the Law. —The Talmud.

"Depart from evil, and do good; seek peace, and pursue it." —Ps. xxxiv., 14.

"Seek ye the Living One, all ye meek of the earth who have kept his ordinances; seek righteousness, seek meekness." —Zephaniah, ii., 3.

"The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the home-born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself." Lev. xix., 34.

"If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again." —Ex. xxiii., 4.

"If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink." —Prov. xxv., 21.

Universal Peace!

O thou sweet mother—Universal Peace!
Thou suckler of the young, thou strength of weak;
Thou leveler of the proud, exalting meek;
Thou clear-eyed Justice, servitude's release,—
O thou sublime, impartial mother Peace,—
Born of the Ages, Wisdom-nurtured,—speak!
Thou spouse of Brother-Love, on whose fair cheek
The glories of approaching dawn increase.
Yearn o'er us from thy empyrean pales,
Thou, toward whose heart man's holiest purpose soars,
In whose sweet eyes the calm of Heav'n prevails;
Whose wind-twined hair is tangled in the stars,
And snow-pure draperies in unending sails,—
Come, bend to us, O vanquisher of wars!

HARRIET BARTNETT

World-Federation League

ADVISORY BOARD

President

OSCAR T. CROSBY

Honorary Vice-Presidents

HON. RICHARD BARTHOLDT

HON. GEO. E. ROBERTS

SAMUEL HILL

Vice-President

HAMILTON HOLT

T. O. Abbott
R. Fleming Arnott
Hon. Richard Bartholdt
W. J. Barnett
Paul T. Brady
Herbert N. Casson
Oscar T. Crosby
Hon. Patrick Egan
Henry G. Granger
John Temple Graves
W. S. Harvey
Hamilton Holt
Adolfo M. Jimenez

Willis Fletcher Johnson
Louis Lande
Hon. Gustav Lindenthal
Hon. Geo. M. Nelson
Hon. Josiah T. Newcomb
Edward W. Parker
W. C. Peyton
B. S. Pray
Richard H. Reed
Hon. Geo. E. Roberts
Charles T. Root
Fred. F. Shedd
Hon. Henry M. Teller
F. Milton Willis

Secretary

F. MILTON WILLIS

Treasurer

WM. C. PEYTON

_____, 1910

The pamphlet herewith,

"The Peace Movement--The Federation of the World."

sets forth some recent contributions to this cause and some public comment upon the proposal concerning a Special Peace Commission; and particularly shows a strong belief, widely held, that Mr. Roosevelt should be actively enlisted in the work of establishing the basis of universal peace among the nations. It also contains a suggested Joint Resolution of Congress favoring world-union for the maintenance of peace, which has recently been introduced in Congress by Hon. Richard Bartholdt, but which will probably be modified to cover merely the appointment of the Special Peace Commission.

It is hoped that your immediate attention will be given to the contents of this pamphlet, and that you will lend your aid in getting the Commission appointed.

Sincerely yours,

F. MILTON WILLIS,

Secretary.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 033 266 208.9